

# A Fairer Hearing

1

Oboe

Voice

Here a li - ttle

Harp

5

ei - ther hand; Cold as pad - do

**A review of music commissioning  
in the UK and the Republic of Ireland**

Keith Allen and Phyllida Shaw

# A Fairer Hearing

1

Oboe

Voice

Harp

Here a li - ttle ch

5

ei - ther hand; Cold as pad - dock

**A review of music commissioning  
in the UK and the Republic of Ireland**

Keith Allen and Phyllida Shaw

Published by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, London 1993

Robert Herrick

*to the commissioners*

David Lumsdaine

**A Child's Grace**

Gently moving

Oboe

Voice

Harp

Here a li - ttle child I stand, Hea - ving up my

ei - ther hand; Cold as pad - docks though they be,

Here I lift them up to Thee, For a be - ni -

son to fall On our meat and on us all.

London, 4/6/93

© David Lumsdaine 1993

Our cover was commissioned from composer David Lumsdaine to whom we are much indebted for choosing and setting such a gently importuning song. We believe that this is the only extant report that you can sing and play, so please feel free to hum as you read.

Keith Allen is an arts administrator and consultant. On graduating from Sussex University, he spent two years touring the Antipodes with a stage hypnotist, before joining Battersea Arts Centre as production manager. He took off to West Virginia for three months to help establish an arts centre before returning to London to work as temporary administrator of the Puppet Centre; he stayed four years. He has been working freelance since 1990.

Phyllida Shaw is a researcher and writer. She has worked as an arts administrator, survived the dying days of the GLC in its arts policy study unit, and went on to spend two years as research officer with the National Campaign for the Arts. Here she developed an appetite for arts policy and management which has kept her occupied, as a freelance researcher and writer, since 1988.

Published by Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation  
98 Portland Place  
London W1N 4ET  
Tel: 071-636 5313

©1993 Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation  
ISBN 0 903319 65 9  
Cover designed by The Upper Room (081-655 3488)  
Distributed by Turnaround Distribution Ltd

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

# CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....i

METHODOLOGY.....ii

INTRODUCTION.....iii

## CHAPTER 1 CURRENT COMMISSIONING PRACTICE

- 1.i. Whose views did we receive in writing?.....1
- 1.ii. Whom did we interview?.....5
- 1.iii. Who commissions music?.....8
- 1.iv. What types of music are commissioned?.....9
- 1.v. Who pays for commissions?.....11
- 1.vi. How much do they pay?.....14
- 1.vii. Who pays the associated costs?.....17
- 1.viii. How much music is commissioned?.....20
- 1.ix. Why commission music?.....23

## CHAPTER 2 CONCERNS ABOUT COMMISSIONING

- 2.i. Misunderstandings.....27
- 2.ii. Criticisms of procedures.....32
- 2.iii. Criticisms of funders' attitudes to commissioning.....35
- 2.iv. How accurate are the criticisms?.....36
- 2.v. Life beyond the commission.....42

## CHAPTER 3 OPTIONS.....45

- 3.i. Improving existing schemes.....48
- 3.ii. New ideas.....54

## APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 The Association of Professional Composers and the Composers' Guild of Great Britain: fee guidelines for serious music commissions in respect of 1994/95...59
- Appendix 2 The Association of Professional Composers/Composers' Guild: commissioning contract...61
- Appendix 3 Composers' Joint Council recommended rates for broadcast commissions...63
- Appendix 4 New Music Commissions Scheme, Arts Council of Ireland: fee guidelines...65
- Appendix 5 Suggested standard application form for commission funding for use by Regional Arts Boards...67
- Appendix 6 Extracts from the promotional folder, *Irish Composers*, produced by the Contemporary Music Centre, Dublin...71
- Appendix 7 Extract from the Music Publishers' Association's submission to the Arts Council of Great Britain, 1989...79

## FOREWORD

The idea for an investigation into music commissioning was not born in a vacuum at the Gulbenkian Foundation. We cannot claim the credit for wondering "if it would be a good idea to..." The impetus was rather an urgent clamour in which speaking - rarely - with one voice, composers, commissioners and funders trumpeted that there must be some better way to manage things. Audiences, though not their sometime tribunes, the critics, were curiously silent though they in many ways stand to gain the most by a reformation of the commissioning system which looks beyond the bureaucratic and into the ethical and aesthetic considerations of the creation of contemporary music. Nonetheless there were enough calls for an informed dispassionate and disinterested review to demand action. *A Fairer Hearing* is an attempt to disentangle much of the prevailing systems and the thinking behind them. It seeks to mark out the 'hows' from the 'whys' of commissioning and in doing so demonstrates that 'how' seems to have become the higher priority and 'why' has lagged behind.

In the present troubled times for public funding of the arts, such priorities are most easily confused. The ship has a serious gash below the water line, what shall we hurl into the lifeboat? The nearest things to hand? Those easiest to transport? Or shall we stand still for a minute and think what we shall be needing in future? Such a pause for thought takes courage. Voices of those in immediate danger are loud and close. The future speaks with no voice at all so is easier to ignore or to declare a second or third priority. But it is the ability and the nerve to look beyond the immediate and importunate that characterise the wise leader.

Of course the sinking ship analogy in this context is a little dangerous: after all when the Titanic went down the band stayed on board - no-one threw them into the lifeboat! But what is the enduring image of that night? It is the band playing on...

**Fiona Ellis**  
**Assistant Director, Arts**  
**Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, UK Branch**

## METHODOLOGY

The two researchers were appointed in August 1992. Their report was submitted in March 1993.

Their brief was to establish whether present arrangements for music commissions work efficiently and effectively and, if they do not, to recommend ways in which those arrangements might be improved.

They undertook a postal survey of a sample of 200 composers, drawn from the membership of the Association of Professional Composers and the Composers' Guild of Great Britain, and entries in the *British Music Yearbook 1992*. Replies were received from 70 composers. The researchers did not ask the respondents to identify themselves (although many did) in the hope that this would elicit the frankest possible comments. It did. A profile of those respondents is given on page 1.

More than 80 individuals and representatives of organisations were interviewed. They included composers, commissioners, players, conductors, administrators, funders, teachers, broadcasters, promoters, publishers and critics. Their names are listed on page 5.

This report is based on conclusions drawn from the study of the written and oral submissions of all those responding to the questionnaire and all those interviewed; on views expressed in the press, and on the findings of earlier reports on composers and commissioning, notably by Alan Rump for the Department of Education and Science and the Arts Council of Great Britain (*How We Treat Our Composers*), Tony Haynes for the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (*Music in Between*) and Louise Donlon for the Arts Council in Dublin. John Muir, formerly the music officer with responsibility for commissioning at the Arts Council of Great Britain, provided the researchers with valuable support and advice in the early stages of the study. Thanks are also due to Sir Alan Peacock, Nicola LeFanu, Rosemary Dixon, Kenneth Baird, Kathryn McDowell, Robert Maycock and John Muir for their comments on the draft of this report.

## INTRODUCTION

Why do we need a report on music commissioning? What seems to be the problem? Is there a crisis in commissioning? Are composers leaving the country for better prospects elsewhere? Have audiences given up on new music?

The creation of music is part of a process that starts with an inspiration or an idea and finishes with the realisation of that inspiration or idea in performance. Commissioning is just one way to pay for the creation of music; it is not the only way and in the great scheme of musical creation, commissioning plays a relatively modest part.

Our brief was to look at the process of commissioning music in the UK and Ireland, but it soon became clear that this could not be done without taking into account activities that are fundamental to the creation and presentation of music, such as audience and repertoire development, publication and recording. Each of these activities has been thoroughly discussed during the course of this study, but they do not form the substance of our report. The focus is specifically and intentionally on *the process of commissioning*. It is concerned with the practice by which the composition of music is encouraged and supported in the UK and Ireland in the early 1990s.

During the course of this study we have neither heard from nor met a composer who expects to earn a living from commissions. The Association of Professional Composers currently has about 260 members: about 50% in the concert music field and 50% in the commercial field. Of those in the concert field, very few would expect to live by commissions alone. Of the 70 composers who completed a questionnaire during the course of this study 77% earned less than half their income as composers from commissions in 1991/2. It is an accepted fact, in both the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, that composers teach, enter competitions, apply for bursaries, accept a residency, and take work outside music to earn a living.

Commissions are, nevertheless, a very important part of most composers' lives and aspirations. They provide income and, just as importantly, endorse and display the composer's work. What prompted this study was the recurring expression of dissatisfaction with the commissioning process, and particularly that supported by the public funding bodies. Composers do not regard themselves as a special case; they do not believe they are any more hard done by than other creative artists, yet they argue repeatedly that commissioning procedures are in need of a shake up. Now, many commissioners, musicians, funders, and critics have given voice to the same argument, and it seems the right moment to take a closer look.



A number of factors have added fuel to the fire in the last year or two. The inexcusably lengthy reorganisation of the regional arts funding system in England, the impending reorganisation of the Arts Council of Great Britain, the imminent devolution of the Scottish and Welsh Arts Councils to the Scottish and Welsh Offices respectively, the increasingly tough competition for customers for live and broadcast music, and the tussle between recording technology and live performance, have all increased the sense of restlessness within the system.

This report does not present a state of crisis; it ignites a warning light. In all areas of artistic production, live and broadcast, visual and performed, commercial and subsidised, budgets are being tightened. Some business sponsors are spending less on the arts than in previous years and some are turning their attention to new areas (although the Association for Business Sponsorship of the Arts reports that the total figure continues to rise). Some trusts, relying on investment income to support composers, may, in some cases, have less to give away.

This report looks principally at the commissioning schemes operated by the Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Commissioning with public funds is a largely post-war phenomenon and in those 50 years the number of commissions supported each year by the arts funding system and the BBC has grown considerably. Fees, too, while still strikingly low, have increased in real terms since Alan Rump completed his study for the Department of Education and Science in 1981.

Publicly funded commissioning is not in crisis, but it is vulnerable. This financial year, 1993/4, in response to a reduction in the government grant to the Arts Council of Great Britain, the music panel of the Arts Council suspended its recording budget (worth £175,000) and made further cuts to project budgets (including composers' bursaries) of £125,000. In an article in the *Guardian*, shortly after the decision was made public, the director of the music department Kenneth Baird was quoted as saying: "We could have reduced commissioning or removed non-western and early music or reduced funding to London-based chamber orchestras. The music panel decided that suspending the recording subsidy would have the least direct impact on performers and creative musicians."

Despite the fact that in 1994/5 the government's grant to the Arts Councils in England, Scotland and Wales and through the Arts Council of Great Britain to the Regional Arts Boards is expected to be further reduced in real terms, leading inevitably to further cuts, the recording subsidy is unique and exceedingly valuable. If at all possible it should be reinstated.

So what do we mean by music commissioning? Commissioning is an act involving the engagement of the services of a composer or composers to create a piece of music, for a given fee, for a particular purpose. Its function is to pay for the creation of music. Commissioning has been practised for as long as the skills of the composer have been recognised as distinct from those of the player or the conductor, and for as long as other parties have wanted to buy their services. It is worth differentiating between commissioning and patronage. Our definition of commissioning does not include awards, bursaries, residencies and other funds provided for the support of composers which do not require the production of a piece of music for a specified number of musicians by a fixed date: this is patronage, not commissioning.

Every commission involves three parties: a composer, a commissioner and a funder of the commission. Sometimes these last two are one and the same. Frequent commissioners in the UK and Ireland include individual musicians, music organisations, the BBC, local authorities, film and television companies, the education sector, the armed services, religious organisations, festivals, theatre, dance and opera companies, and private individuals. Funders include private sector production companies, business sponsors, private patrons, and public funding bodies - the Arts Councils, the Regional Arts Boards, the BBC, local authorities, trusts and foundations, and arts companies.

The process by which music is commissioned is complicated by a variety of factors. In the case of the public funding bodies, issues of representation, accountability and quality are central. A theoretically simple relationship between the funder and the commissioner is often influenced by value judgements and constrained by limited budgets. With private funding sources, questions of representation may be less important, but those of personal taste, suitability and marketability are more so.

Whether guided by carefully crafted policy or free-market forces, commissioning is a cultural intervention. Commissions are not only part of what constitutes our current culture, they are also creating tomorrow's. In the last 40 years our musical vocabulary has become more varied. So too have the instruments and their players. The role of jazz and non-western music, the rise in the popularity of opera, community music, electro-acoustic music, traditional music, and music in film and television have all brought new dynamics and new demands to bear. The development of a more broadly-based and better informed range of consumers, through education, concerts, broadcasting and recordings has whetted the public appetite for certain types of new music and enhanced our ability to consume it. It has also increased access to opportunities to create and prompted calls for the arts funding system to acknowledge a broader definition of creativity.

Certain questions need to be voiced now and borne in mind throughout this report. What importance should the funding bodies give to the creation of music in relation to the support they give to its interpretation? Why is so much new music commissioned, when so little of it is played more than once? Which audiences do the funding bodies and commissioners have in mind when they fund and commission a new work: today's or tomorrow's? And what more can be done to assure this music a place in the recorded, performed and printed repertoire of the next century?

This report is in four chapters: current commissioning practice; concerns about commissioning; a series of options; and the appendices. The options proposed are addressed to those who fund commissions, to commissioners themselves, to composers and, to a lesser extent, to other important players such as the Music Information Centres and the composers' organisations.

Our underlying conclusion is that those who encourage, fund, and manage commissions need to look again at why they do so. Only when that question has been answered will they be able to choose better ways to direct commission funds, improve the experience of commissioning for all concerned and further exploit the investment made in new work.

## CHAPTER 1

# CURRENT COMMISSIONING PRACTICE

### 1.i. Whose views did we receive in writing?

Questionnaires were sent to a random sample of 200 composers: the names were drawn from the membership of the Association of Professional Composers and the Composers' Guild of Great Britain, and from entries in the *British Music Yearbook*. Replies were received from 70. The information below is included to show the range of experience of those composers who contributed their views in writing for use in this report. We are conscious that this sample does not reflect a good balance of ages or race. An attempt was made to correct this imbalance in our choice of interviewees (see 1.ii. below).

*Please note: the numbers below do not add up to 70 in every case since not all respondents answered every question.*

#### a. Gender

Male	54
Female	13

#### b. Age

Under 26	none
26-35	3
36-50	39
51-65	15
66+	8

#### c. Race

One respondent was Indian and one Chinese. All others responding to a question about their racial origin said they were white.

#### d. Experience of the commissioning process

- All 70 respondents had received a paid commission

- 44 had no experience of having had an application for commission funds rejected
- 23 had been involved in applications for commission funds which had been refused
- 30 respondents had served on a commissions panel
- 23 respondents had commissioned work themselves

**e. Source of commissions**

- 39 had received commissions from BBC Radio
- 2 had received commissions from Radio Telefis Eireann (RTE)
- 24 had received commissions from film or television companies
- 43 had received commissions from private individuals in the UK and abroad
- 18 respondents had received commissions from local authorities or local education authorities. The authorities named were:

Avon County Council  
Farnham District Council  
Gloucestershire County Council  
Hampshire County Council  
Harlow District Council  
Huddersfield District Council  
Inner London Education Authority  
Kirklees District Council  
Leeds City Council  
Lothian Regional Council  
Norfolk County Council  
Nottinghamshire County Council  
Richmond upon Thames Borough Council  
Strathclyde Regional Council  
Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council  
Local authorities abroad

- 31 had received financial support from a trust or foundation either towards a commission and associated costs (eg photocopying) or a bursary. Those who named the trust or foundation are listed below; the figure in brackets shows the number of times each was cited:

Barber Trust  
Baring Foundation (2)  
Britten-Pears Foundation  
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (4)  
Chagrin Fund (3)  
Edinburgh Contemporary Arts Trust  
Eric McGavin Trust  
Feeney Trust  
Hinrichsen Foundation (2)  
Holst Foundation (2)  
Leverhulme Trust  
Melos Foundation  
Music and the Deaf  
Radcliffe Trust (2)  
Ralph Vaughan Williams Trust (15)  
Tippett Foundation  
Trusts and foundations abroad

*Please note: not all the above currently offer funds for commissions, and this list should not be used as a reliable mailing list!*

- 20 respondents had received a commission from a commercial business. Businesses named included:

British Aerospace  
British Petroleum  
Cable and Wireless  
Conoco  
Abbey Life  
Arthur Anderson  
Guinness  
Hohner - London  
Johnson's Wax  
Mitsubishi  
Swire

- In addition to music groups (professional and amateur), soloists, festivals and theatre, opera and dance companies, responding composers had received a commission or funding towards a commission from the following:

Places of worship and religious orders  
Publishers  
Record companies  
Universities and colleges of music

Schools  
Summer schools  
Museums  
English Heritage  
Youth and Music  
Canada Council  
French Ministry of Culture  
Gaudeamus (festival funded by the Dutch government)  
German radio  
IRCAM (Paris)  
Massachusetts State Council for the Arts and Humanities  
Universities, music festivals and local funding bodies in Canada, the USA and Europe  
An anonymous commission for a march for an unnamed country

● Respondents had had some dealings with the following bodies, as either a commissioned composer, a commissioner, or as a member of a commissions panel:

The Arts Council of Great Britain	49
The Scottish Arts Council	4
The Welsh Arts Council	5
The Arts Council of Northern Ireland	1
The Arts Council, Ireland	3
Eastern Arts Board	13
East Midlands Arts Board	4
London Arts Board (or Greater London Arts)	20
North West Arts Board (or Merseyside Arts)	6
Northern Arts Board	8
South East Arts Board	8
South West Arts Board	8
Southern Arts Board	7
West Midlands Arts Board	7
Yorkshire and Humberside Arts Board (or Lincolnshire and Humberside or Yorkshire Arts)	11

*Detailed comments about the funding bodies therefore refer mainly to those in England.*

**f. Income from commissions**

Respondents were asked: "As a composer, roughly what percentage of your income came from commissions in 1991/2?" The responses were as follows:

% of income as a composer	number of respondents	% of income as a composer	number of respondents
0%	14	50%	4
5%	10	60%	4
10%	11	70%	3
20%	10	80%	3
30%	6	90%	1
40%	4	100%	0

These figures give no indication of the fees earned by composers from commissions. Some of the composers earning more than 50% of their income from composing only, and not, for example, from teaching, may have a low total income, while some of those earning, say, 10% may have a higher total income. These figures are useful because they show the contribution that commissions make to composers' total income from composition and emphasise how few composers live by commissions alone.

**1.ii. Whom did we interview?****a. Composers**

Michael Alcorn, composer

David Bedford, composer, director of NMC Records, Chair of the Association of Professional Composers

John Buckley, composer

David Byers, composer, BBC Northern Ireland producer

Felix Cross, composer, former member of Arts Council of Great Britain Music Panel

Graham Fitkin, composer, performer, programme director of Society for the Promotion of New Music

Phil Grange, composer, lecturer, Exeter University

Piers Hallawell, composer, lecturer, Queens University, Belfast

Nicola LeFanu, composer, lecturer, London University

Sir John Manduelli, composer, Cheltenham Festival, President of Composers' Guild of Great Britain

Odaline de la Martinez, composer, conductor



Colin Matthews, composer, director of NMC Records, Holst Foundation, Britten-Pears Foundation, member of Performing Right Society donations committee  
Janet Owen-Thomas, composer, teacher  
Anthony Payne, composer, critic  
Priti Paintal, composer  
Stephen Pickett, composer  
Sara Rogers, composer, Chair of Composers' Guild of Great Britain  
Francis Shaw, composer  
Gail Thompson, composer, performer, promoter  
Errollyn Wallen, composer, performer, recording studio manager  
John Walters, composer, producer, publisher of Unknown Public  
Trevor Wishart, composer, lecturer, York University  
Peter Wiegold, composer, performer, lecturer, Guildhall School of Music  
Enid Williams, composer, performer, teacher  
John Woolrich, composer, promoter  
Guy Woolfenden, composer, music director, Royal Shakespeare Company and former director, Cambridge Festival

**b. Commissioners, promoters and music organisations**

Robert Agnew, Belfast Festival  
Chris Bailey, Crescent Arts Centre, Belfast  
Jim Berrow, chair of Birmingham Contemporary Music Group  
Simon Clugsden, player, Birmingham Contemporary Music Group  
James Conway, Opera Theatre Company, Dublin  
Jonathan Cooper, Sonic Arts Network  
David Davies, Paragon, Glasgow  
Odaline de la Martinez, Lontano & European Women's Orchestra  
Niall Doyle, Music Touring Network, Ireland  
Sophie Fuller, Women in Music  
Chris Hodgkins, Jazz Services  
Roots Jackson, Black Music Industry  
Tim Joss, Bournemouth Orchestras & Sound Sense (community music)  
Wilf Judd, The Garden Venture  
Debbie King, Women in Music  
Jane Manning, performer/commissioner  
Dominic McGonigal, Incorporated Society of Musicians  
Ann McKay, Scottish Music Information Centre  
Tom Morgan, British Music Information Centre  
Stephen Newbould, Sound Investment/BCMG  
Shirley Northey, Performing Right Society  
Eve O'Kelly, Centre for Contemporary Music, Dublin  
J Heward Rees, Welsh Music Information Centre

Ian Ritchie, Scottish Chamber Orchestra  
Richard Russell, Sounds Like Birmingham  
Anthony Sargent, Head of Arts, Birmingham City Council  
Richard Steele, Society for the Promotion of New Music/International Society  
for Contemporary Music (British Section)  
Richard Steinitz, Huddersfield International Festival  
John Summers, Northern Sinfonia  
Rebecca Tavener, Cappella Nova  
Mary Wiegold & John Woolrich, Composers Ensemble  
Jane Woolfenden, player, publisher and former director, Cambridge Festival

**c. Composers organisations**

Rosemary Dixon, Association of Professional Composers  
Sir John Manduell, Composers' Guild of Great Britain and Cheltenham Festival  
Sara Rogers, Composers' Guild of Great Britain/composer  
Elizabeth Yeoman, Composers' Guild of Great Britain

**d. Broadcasters**

Andrew Kurowski, BBC Radio 3  
Simon Taylor, RTE  
Seamus Crimmens, FM3  
David Byers, BBC Northern Ireland/composer

**e. Critics not listed elsewhere**

Robert Maycock, critic and journalist

**f. Publishers**

James Rushton, Chesters  
Sally Cavender, Faber  
Sally Groves, Schott & Co  
John Walters, Unknown Public  
Peter Dadswell, Music Publishers' Association (written submission)

**g. Teachers/lecturers not listed elsewhere**

Hilary Bracefield, University of Ulster  
Tim Reynish, Royal Northern College of Music  
Chris Yates, Royal Northern College of Music

## **h. Public funding bodies**

Kenneth Baird, Arts Council of Great Britain  
Kathryn McDowell, Arts Council of Great Britain  
John Muir, freelance, formerly of the Arts Council of Great Britain  
Roy Bohana, Welsh Arts Council  
Helen Jamieson, Scottish Arts Council  
Philip Hammond, Arts Council of Northern Ireland  
Dermot McLaughlin, The Arts Council, Ireland  
Louise Donlon, The Arts Council, Ireland  
Peter Bolton, Southern Arts Board  
Sue Grace, West Midlands Arts Board  
Michael Marx, Yorkshire and Humberside Arts Board  
Andrew McKenzie, London Arts Board  
Mark Monument, Northern Arts Board  
Keith Nimmo, South West Arts Board  
Nick Wells, Eastern Arts Board

## **1.iii. Who commissions music?**

A prerequisite of a commission is a commissioner. The term commissioner is used here to describe the individual or body that contracts a composer to produce a piece of music for a specific purpose. Whatever the category of music – classical, traditional, popular commercial, non-western, electro-acoustic or applied (these are the categories used by the arts funding bodies) – and however the commission is financed, the commissioner is usually either the artist who will perform the new piece or its promoter, and in some cases both. Artists who commission might be soloists, groups of musicians, choirs, opera, dance, theatre or music theatre companies, and they could be professional, semi-professional or amateur. The commission might be for a live or broadcast performance, or for a recording.

The promoter is the individual or body who makes the commission available to the public. That public could be a party of wedding guests or a BBC Radio 3 concert audience of several hundred thousand. Promoters include the players themselves, music directors, festival directors, educational establishments, television, radio and film production companies, the BBC, music libraries, businesses wanting jingles to launch new products, developers celebrating the opening of a new corporate headquarters, or the individual who commissions a piece for an anniversary or event.

#### 1.iv. What types of music are commissioned?

Commissioning is not the only way to instigate or pay for the creation of music. If the total amount of music created in any given year, in all styles and for all purposes, is taken into account, commissioning is a minor player.

The practice of ordering a piece of music from a composer is more common in some styles and applications of music than others. Broadly speaking, commissioning is common practice in those types of music in which the separation of the composer from the performer is greatest. In commercial popular music, the composer and the performer are often the same person. The most certain way to have your music played is to play it yourself. The degree of self-promotion in pop music is such that, until a soloist or band is well established, the likelihood of paying a third party to write a piece is slight. Established performers do commission, but more typically they receive unsolicited tapes and scores from composers and lyricists hoping to find a performer for their work. In rare cases a commission may result. Record companies rarely commission. They tend, instead, to provide funds for musicians to produce an album, with the expectation that they will replace that money when the recording sells.

In jazz also, the writer and the player are also often the same person, and the same principles of self-promotion apply. The improvisatory nature of jazz adds another dimension in which the band, rather than an individual, is the composer. In this case, rehearsal is an integral part of the writing process. Unlike most classical music commissions, the players have considerable influence over the final shape of the piece. Jazz and improvised music are both accepted by most of the arts funding bodies as legitimate candidates for commission funds, although few will consider proposals from bands wanting to commission a member of the band. This ruling was introduced to discourage 'incestuous' or coercive commissioning, but seems misplaced in the case of jazz, where many of the leading bands play the music of their founder. Commission funds for jazz tend to be awarded either to a promoter or to one band to commission a player or composer from another band. In the USA the Meet the Composer/Commissioning Scheme funded by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Readers' Digest allows groups to commission from within their own ranks.

Jazz festivals and concert series often commission pieces, usually from the leader of the group. Jazz groups may also use guest performers and festival commissions to build on this tradition, inviting Band X to create a new piece with Soloist Y. Major changes in the line up reduce the possibility of repeat performances once the festival or series is over. A number of commissions of jazz musicians in Britain come from abroad and the Arts Council of Great Britain has funded jazz commissions from composers who live outside Britain.

Traditional music covers western and non-western folk music, also music which is played in a concert setting and as an accompaniment to other forms of performance or ceremony. Like jazz, much traditional music has a strong element of improvisation and this is one reason why it has not benefited greatly from commissioning schemes. There has been a tendency (now diminishing) to see tradition and innovation as a contradiction in terms. Some traditional music may also have been disqualified by the funding bodies on the grounds that it is not composed by a 'professional' composer. In traditional music, the amateur-professional divide is very unclear, since few people can make a living by writing traditional music.

The guidelines of all arts funding bodies welcome applications for commissions of composers of non-western music, but few are received. The term non-western refers to styles of music and not (as is sometimes assumed) the ethnic origin of the composer. Some non-western contemporary music fits into the traditional music category, some could equally well be classified as contemporary, jazz, popular or applied. The shortage of applications may be due, in part, to the fact that the existence of commission funds is unknown to musicians playing non-western music and, in part, to the fact that some of those musicians may not think that commissioning is the appropriate way to pay for the creation of new work. (NB The Arts Council of Great Britain's fund for non-western music supports tours by musicians playing non-western music rather than commissions.)

Producers of dance productions, musicals, music theatre and opera all regularly commission composers and may apply to the funding bodies for this purpose. (The Arts Council of Great Britain has separate funds earmarked for this category of commission.) Musical in the commercial sector may start life as subsidised productions or they may be funded by the producing house from the outset. As in jazz, these types of commission tend to include a considerable element of rehearsal and adaptation of the original score. In both cases, a librettist may also be involved.

There are three other terms used in this report that need to be defined: *community music*, *applied music* and *library music*. *Community music* is defined by an approach to music-making rather than a specific musical style. The four principles of community music are access, equal opportunity, decentralisation of decision-making processes, and active participation and creativity. These principles could be applied equally to a community choir, a brass band for elderly players, and a rock music workshop. Most of the funding bodies would consider applications to their commission funds from a group in this category, provided a professional composer is involved.

Applied music is written to accompany or enhance another activity, such as a film, a television documentary, or an advertisement. Incidental music for a theatre production can also be classified as applied music. Some public funding is available for some forms of live and recorded applied music, and many publicly funded television programmes and films commission music using public money. More commonly, applied music is commissioned by the producing company or broadcaster. Composers working in this field often have to work at great speed, since they can only write after the product they are accompanying is complete.

Library or production music can also be described as applied music, but it is music that has not yet *been* applied. Library music is commissioned by music library publishers and stored in recorded form, usually on CD, for use by film, television, audiovisual, video and radio production companies in programmes, advertisements and presentations. Music for a car chase or a frightening episode, for example, is often library music, as are many of television's best known theme tunes. The composer receives no fee for writing the piece, which may last a few seconds or several minutes, but the library pays for the reproduction of the work and splits the profits from the hire with the composer.

It is in classical, or contemporary serious, music that commissioning is the commonest way for soloists and groups to acquire a new piece of music. Here, the separation of the creator (the composer) and the interpreter (the player and the conductor) is at its most distinct. The composer has a definable skill that the commissioner wants to buy.

### 1.v. Who pays for commissions?

The underlying principle of a commission is that the composer is paid a fee for the music he or she has been asked to write, but in practice this is not always observed. Payment is usually made by the commissioner, but in some cases the funding body pays the composer direct. Where this is not the case, the money comes from a production budget (as in the case of a film or television company) or from a budget specifically for that purpose (BBC Radio 3 or RTE, for example) or it may be provided (in whole or in part) by a third party. The third party is likely to be a public funding body, such as an arts council, regional arts board or local authority, a business sponsor, a trust or a private patron.

Most commissioners of concert music look for a third party (eg a commercial sponsor, a local education authority, an arts council or regional arts board) to contribute to the composer's fee. Indirect support for commissions via a grant to, or sponsorship of, a festival, a concert series or a production is very common.

An opera, dance or music theatre company can apply to a funding body for a grant towards production costs which may include a composer's fee, or it may apply separately to a commission fund.

#### **a. Trusts**

There are a number of charitable trusts which support the writing, performance, recording or publication of new work. Some restrict themselves to one of these areas, others mix and match, and guidelines and priorities change from year to year. Among the best known of the trusts with an interest in commissions are the Holst Foundation, the John S Cohen Foundation, the Ralph Vaughan Williams Trust, the Britten-Pears Foundation, the Feeney Trust, the Finzi Trust, the Delius Trust, the Peter Moores Foundation and the Hinrichsen Foundation. Several other trusts will consider supporting commissions, although they may not cite it as a priority.

The \*Holst Foundation, for example, has been supporting commissions for seven years. The total amount of money available each year is small (up to £15,000 per year) and so the works supported have been for small ensembles of no fewer than four players and for pieces lasting not less than ten minutes. This year applications will be restricted to string quartets. Each award includes an allowance for the copying costs of unpublished composers and for rehearsal time. A major initiative of the Holst Foundation has been its support for the new music record label NMC, started by two composers, Colin Matthews and David Bedford, with a view to distributing new music more widely. The Foundation invested £400,000 over two and a half years. Launched in 1992, and initially administered by the Society for the Promotion of New Music, the NMC has produced ten recordings and has 12 more 'in the can'.

The Ralph Vaughan Williams Trust (which is highly praised by composers responding to our questionnaire) has funded commissions and performances and is currently offering bursaries to composers of electro-acoustic music; the John S Cohen Foundation has provided funding for first and second performances of work by living composers; the Britten-Pears Foundation is a major supporter of the Aldeburgh Festival (£150,000 per year) and currently spends around £10,000 on commissions elsewhere. The Britten-Pears has also established the Britten Award for Composition worth £10,000 and a recording, for a UK composer. The Radcliffe Trust, which specialises in supporting music and the crafts, apprenticeships and fellowships, has been the sole funder of the residency of Mark Anthony Turnage with the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra, now in its third year.

The trusts tend to be well-liked by composers and commissioners for what appears to be a more inclusive approach to commissioning than the arts funding bodies currently offer. There is, however, a much lower level of expectation that trusts *should* support composers and the performance of their work. All money is gratefully received.

*\*It was the Holst Foundation in the 1980s that was behind a series of seven composers' residencies with the National Centre for Orchestral Studies (no longer operating) during which the composers were under no obligation to produce anything other than musical sketches. The scheme was designed to give composers the freedom to fail.*

### **b. Individuals**

Although 44 of the 70 composers replying to the questionnaire had received a commission from an individual (in this country or abroad) commissions from individuals account for a very thin slice of the funding cake. In the UK there are no tax advantages for individual patrons of composers, unless money is covenanted over four years to an arts organisation with charitable status.

An interesting scheme initiated by the Birmingham Contemporary Music Group is currently being piloted. The scheme is called Sound Investment and invites individuals and organisations to buy 'shares' in a new work at £100 per share. Strictly speaking this is individual sponsorship, since there is no financial return on the investment. The number of units offered for sale to private sponsors (who may be individuals or small institutions, such as a school or residential home) depends upon the amount of money raised for the commission from public sources. If, for example, £2,000 of a £3,000 fee is raised from the Regional Arts Board, the £1,000 balance of the fee will be offered as ten £100 units for sale to individual sponsors, or investors, as they are known. In return, the investor's name is printed on the score and he/she receives an invitation to the premiere. The scheme is being independently evaluated on behalf of the Arts Council of Great Britain which has provided funds for the scheme's administration.

### **c. Royalties**

Royalties from public performances and broadcasts are payable by venue operators, promoters and broadcasters and collected by the Performing Right Society (PRS) on behalf of composers, lyricists and music publishers. There are societies that perform a similar function in most developed countries. The Republic of Ireland has its own organisation, the Irish Music Rights Organisation



(IMRO). In most cases, the licence fee payable to PRS is based on a percentage of the box office takings. PRS makes no profits for itself and the licence fee collected is, less operating costs, split between the composer and publisher of the music.

In January 1992, PRS introduced a policy for distributing royalties for live performances of music which has caused concern amongst composers, particularly among those whose work is performed mainly in education and community venues. Previously, PRS attempted to obtain programme returns from all concerts and recitals of classical music and from other concerts and events where the licence fee payable to PRS was over £200. The New Live Music Distribution policy targets 550 'significant' venues, 50 arts festivals, and all events and tours which generate a PRS licence fee of £500 or more, wherever they take place. The new policy does not affect the PRS licensing operation. All venues where music is performed must still obtain a PRS licence.

Composers whose work is performed in venues that do not appear on that list are concerned that their income from royalties will decrease. About 6% of revenue from live performance royalties is used to provide money that is distributed to composers for unlogged performances.

The PRS has trebled the fee for unlogged performances to £75 and has agreed to review the policy after the first distribution is made, in July 1993, to see whether composers are suffering a significant downturn in income. One argument used to support what seems at first sight to be low commission fees is that the composer will earn additional monies from the publication and performance of the work. If, under the new PRS policy, composers find that their related earnings are going down, this will provide even more ammunition for the argument that commission fees need to be higher.

Composers working in the applied field receive a performance fee, synchronisation fee and royalties from successive performances via the Mechanical Copyright Protection Society. The Association of Professional Composers estimates that there are more composers earning a living solely through composition in the applied music field than in the concert field. In the case of film and television music, a commission may have a life in a recording that long outlives the dramatic work of which it was a part.

#### **1.vi. How much do they pay?**

The arts funding bodies in the UK aim to observe the fee guidelines drawn up by the Association of Professional Composers and the Composers' Guild of Great Britain and endorsed by the Arts Council of Great Britain, the Regional

Arts Boards and the Incorporated Society of Musicians. (The BBC also aims to observe the guidelines, although a number of composers believe the BBC pays less. The Arts Council in Ireland uses a different, lower scale, see Appendix 4.) A range of fees is suggested for each configuration of musicians, with the higher end of the range intended for more established composers.

The levels of fees are based on three assumptions:

- the fee will not be the sole income earned by the composer for a piece of work;
- in very general terms, the fee reflects the amount of time likely to be spent by the composer in writing the work;
- the fee is at a level that commissioners are likely to pay.

(As will be seen in Chapter 2, composers challenge the suggestion that the fee for composition should be calculated on the basis of what they *might* earn in royalties, and they do not agree that the fees reflect the amount of time spent on a composition.)

It is now rare for any funding body to offer 100% of the fee requested by the commissioner. This is a major cause of frustration for composers who say that they frequently receive less than the sum agreed. The reason they accept this situation is that they want, above all, to write the piece and they will not hold out for a fee that they know the commissioner cannot raise.

Those funders that offer only part-funding for commissions give the following reasons:

- they have limited budgets at their disposal and want as many composers as possible to benefit;
- they want to encourage the commissioner to show a commitment by raising at least part of the fee him/herself.

What this practice overlooks is the varying ability of the commissioner to make up the balance of the fee. It may be reasonable to expect a symphony orchestra, or major theatre company, or an ensemble with paid administrative staff to raise the balance of the fee or to set aside a budget for commissioning, but, according to composers, the smaller groups habitually fail to raise additional funds.

Few of the smaller ensembles or bands, let alone the soloists, have the contacts or experience or administrative resources to raise a thousand pounds or more from other sources. Most are ineligible to raise funds from trusts because they do not, themselves, have charitable status and they are unattractive propositions for commercial sponsors.

The policy of part-funding is blamed by some commissioners and composers for deterring inexperienced ensembles from commissioning. Unofficially, many of the music officers to whom we talked recognise this fact.

The Arts Council in Ireland has gone some way towards solving the problem by operating a sliding scale of awards, according to the perceived ability of the commissioner to raise the balance of the fee. The Scottish Arts Council tried to protect the composer against partial payment of an agreed fee by insisting on proof that the commissioner *has* raised and paid the composer its share of the fee before the Council will hand over its part, but as will become clear in Chapter 2, even this is not a fool-proof system.

The only loser in a system of part-funding is the composer, who produces the piece in spite of the fact that the fee is often lower than initially discussed. The commissioner gets a piece, the funding body gets a piece and the public gets a piece. The composer gets a premiere but has had to subsidise the commission herself. Of course composers could refuse fees they consider too small but, above all, they want their work to be played and the pressure on them to accept what they are offered, especially at the beginning of their careers, is considerable. One composer pointed out that fees are so low that there is no question of composing to make money and so composing for a bit less than originally anticipated is no great loss. For composers on very low incomes, however, a loss of even £50 is significant and the sums in question are usually greater than that.

The funding bodies are well aware that the composer is often placed in this invidious position. They are also aware that some commissioners will apply for more than they need in the hope that the amount awarded by the funding body will be close to the sum required, but more often than not the funding bodies are simply colluding in the underpayment of artists. While the funder could advise the composer not to start work until the first instalment of the fee is received from the commissioner. In practice, the composer very often starts work before the funding body has made its decision (in order to have the piece ready in time), and long before the first payment would be due.

Part-funding in jazz, traditional, non-western and electro-acoustic music tends to present a further problem. Smaller groups are frequently part-time affairs; few receive any kind of regular public funding, and there are rarely administrative

staff to take on the task of fundraising. Every composer, player and promoter working in these areas of music, when interviewed, has put the case for rehearsal costs to be included in an enhanced commission fee.

### **1.vii. Who pays the associated costs?**

The composer's fee is only part of the cost of the creation and production of a new piece of music. There are four other possible areas of expenditure associated with a commission:

- copying and printing the music
- rehearsals
- hire charges levied by the music publisher (if there is one)
- recording costs.

#### **a. Copying**

The debate about who should pay the copying costs is a long-running one between the funders, the publishers, the commissioners and the composers. For a large work the cost can be several thousand pounds.

In the case of a published composer, the copying bill is usually met by the publisher. Sometimes the publisher asks the commissioner for a contribution towards the cost. The commissioner may agree on condition that it is an advance against what it will have to pay in hire fees.

Composers who do not have a publisher are expected to pay for the cost of copying, which they may or may not be able to claim back from the commissioner or the funding body. Composers do not usually receive the second instalment of their fee until they submit the score and a set of parts. They therefore have to find the funds to pay the copyist before the second instalment of the fee arrives. For many composers this presents a serious cashflow problem. Composers argue that an advance to cover copying costs of unpublished composers should be earmarked as part of the fee and paid in advance.

Most of the funding bodies have a small amount set aside for copying costs, but they tend not to advertise the fact very loudly for fear of being oversubscribed. The Arts Council of Great Britain has such a fund, but most of the composers who receive a commission are published composers and so do not need a contribution to copying costs, much as the publishers would appreciate one. The Society for the Promotion of New Music administers the Francis Chagrin Fund which is 'open to British composers (or composers resident in the UK) to help

cover the costs that they have personally incurred, by reproducing performance materials for works awaiting their first performance'. In the Republic of Ireland, the Irish Music Rights Organisation will pay the copying costs of all composers (without a publisher) commissioned with funds from the Arts Council.

According to the Music Publishers' Association (MPA), "publishing contemporary music is not commercially viable; it is not a profit-making activity". This is because the outlay on production of parts, promotion and staff costs exceed the income from hire fees, royalties and the sale of scores. "This is true even for the work of a widely performed, internationally acclaimed composer," says the MPA. "The break-even point *if* the composer becomes well-established may come 20 years, 30 years or more after the appearance of the first published work."

In 1989 the MPA wrote to the Arts Council of Great Britain with documentation showing publishers' expenditure on a selected number of works compared with their income (see Appendix 7). The MPA argued that the increase in the number of commissions awarded by the public funding bodies was placing publishers under considerable financial strain. The situation has become more urgent because many lucrative early 20th-century copyrights, which were used to subsidise living composers, have now expired or are about to expire. The MPA drew the Arts Council of Great Britain's attention to state subsidies abroad for the publication of new music. In France the Ministry of Culture reimburses 40% of the publisher's copying costs; in the United States, copying costs are covered by the commissioner, who receives one sum of money to pay the composer and one to produce performing materials; in the Netherlands, public funds are available to pay for the publication of scores; in Ireland, as noted above, copying costs are covered by the Irish Music Rights Organisation.

The MPA's plea for an Arts Council of Great Britain contribution to copying costs for work with more than 25 individual parts, by British composers, fell on deaf ears and still does.

## **b. Rehearsals**

The cost of rehearsing the new piece is generally covered by the commissioner, except in jazz where rehearsal costs are sometimes provided by the funder. These costs are regularly cited by the larger performing organisations as a reason why new works are not performed more often. In classical music the standard repertoire requires considerably less rehearsal than a new work and is therefore cheaper to produce.

There is strong argument that commissions of concert music would benefit from more rehearsals with the composer in attendance. This would give the composer an opportunity to find out what works and what does not, and would give the performers a greater sense of involvement in the creation of the piece. Performances of new work can be stilted and lacklustre and players can seem to dislike what they are playing. Too often they are having to decipher badly copied scores and manage on inadequate rehearsal time. There may be an argument here for some allowance for rehearsal costs to be included in awards for commissions. (The American Meet the Composer/Commissioning Scheme asks applicants to state how much time will be allocated to rehearsals, to be certain that this has been taken into account, although it does not offer to pay for them.) As mentioned above, some of the trusts include the costs of rehearsals in their awards to composers. Jazz promoters and players regard this provision as essential to the development of a new piece.

### c. Recordings

As far as we are aware the London Arts Board (LAB) is the only public funding body that reserves a proportion of its commission awards (5% of commission fees over £3,000) to be spent on a Digital Audio Tape recording of the new work. The LAB's reasoning is that the tape provides a record of the premiere and a potential sales tool both for the composer and the commissioner. At this level, recording is not unreasonably expensive. An engineer, a desk and four microphones can be hired for around £300. In a good venue, for a little more, it may be possible to make a sufficiently good recording to be transferred to a Compact Disc, which can now be produced for as little as £1 per unit. Clearly, the players must be consulted about the intended use of the recording and be offered payment as necessary.

The Holst Foundation's support for the prolific NMC label is due to expire in 1994, by which time it will have invested £400,000 in recordings of new music. John Walters' new quarterly CD publication, *Unknown Public*, seems to have got off to a good start, with support from the Arts Foundation and the London Arts Board.

Given the potential to develop audiences for new music through recordings, the debate about the funding bodies' relationship to recording is likely to get noisier rather than quieter. The Arts Council of Great Britain's decision to suspend its recording budget in 1993/4 prompted several letters to the press and an article in the *Guardian* which pointed out that in the last seven years the scheme had contributed to the making of more than 200 CDs of contemporary, folk, non-western and jazz music. Meanwhile the Scottish Arts Council has recently deferred a decision to establish a Scottish Arts Council label.

Throughout this study, composers and the promoters of new music have forcefully made the point that recording is vital to the dissemination of new music and in the past many composers have benefited from subsidised recording schemes operated by the Welsh Arts Council, the British Council and the Gulbenkian Foundation, among others.

More people listen to music on record than in the concert hall. It is a market for new music that cannot be ignored. Undoubtedly the best place to experiment with different types of music is at home: for the price of a concert ticket (or less) a listener can invest in a CD and listen to new work at home, without having to commit himself to an evening in a concert hall.

### **1.viii. How much music is commissioned?**

In recent years the arts funding bodies have made great efforts to broaden the range of applications to their commission funds and the list of commissions awarded reflects this shift. There is more jazz, more music theatre, more electro-acoustic work, more music in traditional styles, but taken as a whole, the greatest proportion of commission funds goes to composers of contemporary classical music. This applies particularly to the Arts Councils where the pattern of applications to the commissioning schemes simply reflects the type of music the clients of these funders play. Applications from the classical field inevitably outnumber those in jazz, improvised music, non-western and traditional styles.

The proportion of non-classical commissions funded by the Regional Arts Boards is greater than the those backed by the Arts Councils. Applicants to the Regional Arts Boards tend to be smaller and more varied in style. Most of the funding bodies have funds to pay for commissions of opera, theatre music and dance music, but concert music is the most commonly commissioned.

As Table 1 shows, the arts funding system helps to fund in the region of 250 commissions per year. The Arts Council of Great Britain is the most prolific supporter. Of the total commission awards made by the arts funding bodies in 1991/2, the Arts Council of Great Britain was responsible for over 30% of pieces commissioned and invested almost 42% of total expenditure on commissions by the Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards. However, the Arts Council of Great Britain's commissioning fund accounts for only a tiny percentage of the total music budget.

**Table 1**

**Number of music commissions funded by the Arts Councils' and Regional Arts Boards' commissioning budgets, 1991/2. (Several pieces were written by more than one composer.)**

<b>Funders</b>	<b>No of commissions</b>	<b>No of composers</b>	<b>Total £ awarded</b>
Arts Council of Great Britain	75	67	**195,915
Scottish Arts Council	21	21	31,850
Welsh Arts Council	24	17	22,680
Arts Council of N. Ireland	9	8	8,928
Arts Council, Ireland	8	8	10,590
Eastern Arts Board	12	12	15,550
East Midlands Arts Board	7	7	10,825
London Arts Board*	16	25	45,800
Northern Arts Board	10	11	17,617
North West Arts Board*	9	9	13,555
Southern Arts Board	12	12	15,900
South East Arts Board	9	9	7,750
South West Arts Board	14	20	20,040
West Midlands Arts Board	10	12	22,900
Yorkshire & Humberside Arts Board	16	16	6,630
	<b>252</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>£446,530</b>

\*London Arts Board and North West Arts Board both submitted figures for 1992 rather than 1991, since both had introduced new policies following their reorganisation in 1991.

\*\*In addition to this figure for music commissions, the ACGB music department contributed £50,000 to five opera commissions.



BBC Radio 3 is both a commissioner and a broadcaster and aims to commission in the region of 25 pieces each year, mainly for the BBC Orchestras and Singers. No financial details are published. The works are commissioned for the Proms, for festivals (such as Huddersfield, where the rest of the programme might make an interesting live broadcast) and for studio broadcast. The pieces commissioned range from quartets to symphonies; solos and duets are rare.

Composers who commented to us on their experience of being commissioned by BBC Radio 3 tended to be more complimentary than they are about the funding bodies. They felt the staff knew the field, had studied the form and only commissioned composers to whom they were committed, and ensured that the composer was commissioned to write a piece he or she was 'burning' to write. No cynical commissioning here. As with the arts funding system, composers were uncertain about the detailed workings of the commissioning process, but appreciated the directness of the relationship and the relative freedom they were given.

In every case the funds available for commissioning from the arts funding bodies make up a very small proportion of the parent budget (eg the music budget or the performing arts budget) in relation to the sums invested in the performance of music. Percentages here are meaningless since the costs of interpretation (eg paying for a 90-strong orchestra or a 15-piece jazz band) are significantly higher than the cost of commissioning, but we still need to know the funding bodies' level of commitment to commissioning and to what extent this is reflected in the level of funding.

There are two possible measures:

- are the funds over-subscribed and are the funding bodies therefore turning down a large number of applications?
- how much are the funders doing to promote their commission funds?

Responses to the first question vary. Northern Arts Board, for example, estimates that it can provide some level of funding to most of the eligible applications it receives; South East Arts Board funds more than 50% of eligible applications; the Arts Council of Great Britain made awards to almost 80% of applicants in 1991/2. The overall picture is that applicants have more than a 50/50 chance of success.

Several music officers volunteered the view that if they were to promote the commission schemes more actively, they might not be able to satisfy the demand. It would be false to portray the music officers as passive in this area of their work. They are not. For the most part they invest considerable time and energy

in developing ideas with potential applicants and, in some cases, even looking for concert dates. It is, however, a fact that most of the Arts Council of Great Britain and Regional Arts Board music budgets have fixed commitments to a core of clients and that there is very little scope for enlarging project budgets, one of which is for commissions. The irony is that while the funding bodies strongly encourage music organisations to be innovative and to commission and perform new work, they are not providing sufficient means with which to do it.

### **1.ix. Why commission music?**

Questions about why music is commissioned have arisen largely in response to the perceived unpopularity of much of what is being written, particularly in the contemporary classical field. When commissioners are asked why they commission, their answers differ according to the context of the commission, but three reasons crop up repeatedly: creativity, commercial advantage and because it is what the funding bodies expect.

There is a strong impulse on the part of most commissioners to support the creation of new work for its own sake. There is no such thing as stasis in the arts, one suggested. You either grow or you rot, but there can be no standing still. If there is to be research and development in the arts, then commissioning is part of that process and a valid activity in its own right.

The second motive, commercial advantage, features in all areas of music from the commission of the catchy tune that helps to sell a new brand of toothpaste to the chamber ensemble or jazz band that believes it has more chance of keeping its ticket-buying audiences if it presents them with interesting new work.

The third motive, pressure from the funding bodies, presents subsidised musicians with a real dilemma. Whatever their formation, from folk groups to jazz bands to symphony orchestras, they tend to be strongly encouraged by funders to include new works (although not necessarily work they have commissioned) in their repertoire. From a musical point of view most groups would probably willingly bow to the pressure. From an economic point of view, it presents a difficulty, for while with one breath the funder asks for new work, with the other it asks the group to reduce its dependence on the public purse and to raise more income, mainly from sponsorship and ticket sales. A recent article in the *Irish Times* attacked the Radio Telefis Eireann Orchestra for bending to commercial pressures and failing to promote the work of living Irish composers.

In the orchestral world especially, where competition for audiences is tough, where overheads are high, and where the public and sponsors prefer the traditional repertoire, the presentation of new work can be a high financial risk. It is no surprise to find that concert programmers tend either to sandwich a new work between two highly popular pieces, or to confine all their new work to one concert per season.

The low profile of living composers in Britain's classical repertoire was highlighted in 1991 by the Policy Studies Institute's analysis of the concert programmes of three leading orchestras (*Cultural Trends* 1991, No 12). Including repeat performances, of the 97 works performed by the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra, five were by living composers (two British, three foreign); of the 136 works performed by the Hallé, nine were by living composers (two British, seven foreign) and of the 174 works played by the Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra, 11 were by living composers (six British and five foreign).

So what has happened to the several thousand works of concert music that have been commissioned in the last 20 years? Many scores are lodged each year with the music information centres in London, Glasgow, Cardiff and Dublin, never to be heard again. None of the music information centres has sufficient resources to promote composers as much as they would like to. Questions of quality have been raised repeatedly during the course of this study, by composers as well as players, commissioners, funders, promoters and critics. It is impossible to ignore the many voices that state, quite bluntly, that much of what is written is not good enough to warrant a second hearing. In all fields of development, artistic or otherwise, there is a strong element of trial and error, of hit or miss. This is not an argument against commissioning. The difficulty is that the financial pressures on performing groups are so great that risk has become a luxury rather than a necessity.

This is bad news for composers, especially those without a track record. A composer writes to be heard, and to be heard more than once. Without conviction and commitment on the part of the commissioner, a new piece of music is unlikely to be exploited to its full potential. Some funding bodies may consider that they should not support a commission unless they are reasonably certain that the piece, if liked, will be given a thorough airing. Some funders may decide to fund fewer commissions better, complete with the cost of realisation and subsidised performances, or to divert funds from their performing arts clients towards the presentation of new music. The point must be made that there is, in the UK and the Republic of Ireland, a cult of the premiere in which the all-important first performance (which is rarely the best performance) overshadows further exposure of the new piece.

In other areas of music the debate about the value and purpose of commissioning is less fraught. There are two main reasons: first, in jazz, traditional music and popular commercial music it is far more common for the promoter to be the commissioner. This brings with it a commitment to present the work in the best possible light. Second, very few of the performers of this kind of music have a relationship with a funding body, except on a project by project basis and as such they may be less sensitive to pressure from funders to promote new work, or they may be doing it anyway. In addition, the amount of money at stake tends to be smaller. A further reason is that in traditional music, popular commercial music and jazz, new work stands or falls by the audience's response. An unpopular piece is soon forgotten; a popular piece will be brought back by popular demand.

## CHAPTER 2

### CONCERNS ABOUT COMMISSIONING

Composers, commissioners, funders and promoters have expressed very similar concerns about the current arrangements for music commissioning. Sometimes they agree, sometimes they contradict one other, but most seem to believe that the system is in need of an overhaul.

Composers fall into two camps: those who are grateful for every penny of financial support that comes their way (whether from business sponsors, trusts, individuals or public funding bodies) and who negotiate the various application procedures as best they can; and those who believe the system is inadequate in most respects and say so. Every one of the composers who took part in the survey has had experience of receiving a commission. Many have served on funding body selection panels; a few have commissioned music themselves. Most of their criticisms are reserved for the funders of commissions; the promoters (including publishers, record companies and concert promoters) are the target of a gentler wave of discontent. This chapter summarises and comments on their concerns.

#### 2.i. Misunderstandings

A small number of composers who made written submissions or who were interviewed misunderstood the role and practice of the Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards. Several, for example, believed that the Arts Council of Great Britain only awards commission funds to commissioners who are already Arts Council clients. This is not entirely the case (see table on page 21). It is, however, a fact that commissioners that are not Arts Council clients may only apply to the Arts Council if they are planning to tour a piece to at least three regions, or to premiere the work abroad. (It is worth noting here that many composers have pointed out that the sums available from the Regional Arts Boards are lower than those from the Arts Council of Great Britain and that commissioners who are not Arts Council clients and who wish to commission a relatively expensive piece, may find themselves with no hope of attracting a substantial proportion of the composer's fee from the public purse.) One composer was certain that Regional Arts Board decisions are made on ideological grounds first and artistic grounds second. This too is a misconception.

Given the remoteness of the composer from the application and decision-making process, it is not surprising that misunderstandings have arisen and that one bad experience colours a composer's view of a particular funding body or commissioner for life. The funding body's relationship is with the commissioner (the applicant for funds) and not with the composer. The composer agrees in principle to the commissioner's proposal (which the composer or her publisher may have made to the commissioner in the first instance), endorses the application form and sits back to await a decision. The composer is rarely invited to meet the funder and receives her information about the process secondhand, through the commissioner.

Written guidelines on the commissioning schemes are published by all Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards, and these are available to anyone who asks for them, yet only those composers who make it their business to find out, or who sit or have sat on a selection panel have any clear idea of how the system works, of how commissions are selected, and of the different roles of the paid officers and the unpaid advisers or selectors. Even then, we have talked to advisers who clearly lack a sufficiently thorough knowledge of the system of which they are a part.

Table 2 charts the similarities and differences between the commissioning schemes of the five Arts Councils and the ten Regional Arts Boards. It illustrates the number of minor differences which add up to a need for applicants to learn 15 different sets of rules rather than one. Some funders award commissions only to performing groups based in the region, others will support groups that undertake to premiere a work in the region; some pay the composer, some pay the commissioner; some offer copying costs, others do not; some require one performance only, others ask for three.

**Table 2**

**A comparison of key features of the commission schemes of the Arts Councils (AC) and Regional Arts Boards (AB).**

<b>Number of performances usually required</b>	
AC of Great Britain	3
Scottish AC	1
Welsh AC	1
AC of Northern Ireland	1
AC of Ireland	3
Eastern AB	1
East Midlands AB	1
London AB	3 in venues of at least 200 seats
Northern AB	2 for festivals, otherwise 3
North West AB	2
Southern AB	3
South East AB	3
South West AB	3
West Midlands AB	3
Yorks & Humberside AB	3 for chamber work; 2 for medium-scale work
<b>Number of selection meetings</b>	
AC of Great Britain	3
Scottish AC	2
Welsh AC	1
AC of Northern Ireland	As required
AC of Ireland	2
Eastern AB	2
East Midlands AB	2
London AB	1
Northern AB	3-4
North West AB	2
Southern AB	3
South East AB	2
South West AB	2
West Midlands AB	2
Yorks & Humberside AB	4
<b>Eligible composers</b>	
AC of Great Britain	Any, except students and those with a close connection with the commissioner
Scottish AC	Any, except students
Welsh AC	Any
AC of Northern Ireland	Any, except students. The interests of NI composers will be taken into
AC of Ireland	Irish or resident in the Republic
Eastern AB	Any, except students

East Midlands AB	Composer or commissioner must be based in East Midlands. No students
London AB	Any, except students
Northern AB	Any, except students and those with a close connection with the commissioner
North West AB	Any, except students and those with a close connection with the commissioner
Southern AB	Any, except students
South East AB	Any, except students and those with a close connection with the composer
South West AB	Any, except students
West Midlands AB	Any, except students
Yorks & Humberside AB	Must be professional. British encouraged. No students or those with a close connection with the commissioner

**Eligible commissioners**

AC of Great Britain	Any Arts Council client, <i>or</i> any work that will tour <i>or</i> that will be premiered abroad
Scottish AC	Based in Scotland. Amateur or professional
Welsh AC	Based in Wales
AC of Northern Ireland	Organisations, festivals, ensembles and individual performers
AC of Ireland	Anyone, amateur or professional, based in the Republic. Exclusions: composers wanting to commission themselves, and sacred work for performance at religious festivals
Eastern AB	EAB clients <i>or</i> anyone planning a premiere in the region, but not as part of larger tour (which could be AC of Great Britain funded)
East Midlands AB	EMA clients; composer or commissioner must be based in East Midlands; applications must be for less than £4,000. Improvising ensembles welcome
London AB	Promoters only, and of London-wide significance
Northern AB	Promoters and ensembles planning premiere in region
North West AB	Preference given to groups or individuals based in the region
Southern AB	Promoters, groups and individuals, for work to be premiered in the region
South East AB	Musicians and promoters
South West AB	All, including composers
West Midlands AB	Promoters, venues and arts organisations in West Midlands
Yorks & Humberside AB	Individual or group promoting premiere in the region

**Styles**

AC of Great Britain	All	
Scottish AC	All	
Welsh AC	All	
AC of Northern Ireland	All	
AC of Ireland	All	Collaborations encouraged
Eastern AB	All	
East Midlands AB	All	
London AB	All	Broadcast potential encouraged. Emphasis on high quality work
Northern AB	All	



North West AB	All	
Southern AB	All	
South East AB	All	
South West AB	All	
West Midlands AB	All	Priority for work that extends new audiences and presents in new ways
Yorks & Humberside AB	All	Work with potential to develop interest in contemporary music

---

**Payment for the commission is made to**

AC of Great Britain	Commissioner
Scottish AC	First 50% to commissioner; second 50% to composer
Welsh AC	Commissioner
AC of Northern Ireland	Commissioner, usually once work is completed
AC of Ireland	Composer
Eastern AB	Composer
East Midlands AB	Composer
London AB	Composer
North West AB	Commissioner
Northern AB	Composer
Southern AB	Commissioner
South East AB	Composer
South West AB	Commissioner
West Midlands AB	Commissioner
Yorks & Humberside AB	Composer

---

**Is the commissioner expected to provide part of the composer's fee?**

AC Great Britain	Yes, almost always
Scottish AC	Always
Welsh AC	Sometimes
AC of Northern Ireland	Sometimes
AC of Ireland	Usually, but on a sliding scale according to ability to pay
Eastern AB	Sometimes, if EAB's offer is below APC rates
East Midlands AB	Sometimes
London AB	Sometimes
Northern AB	Sometimes
North West AB	Always
Southern AB	Always
South East AB	Usually
South West AB	Usually
West Midlands AB	Always
Yorks & Humberside AB	Usually

---

**Does the funding body provide or contribute to copying costs?**

AC of Great Britain	Possible
Scottish AC	Possible
Welsh AC	No
AC of Northern Ireland	Yes
AC of Ireland	Covered by IMRO
Eastern AB	Possible

East Midlands AB	Possible	
London AB	Possible	
Northern AB	Possible	Rehearsal & studio costs also
North West AB	Possible	
Southern AB	Possible	
South East AB	Possible	
South West AB	Possible	
West Midlands AB	No	
Yorks & Humberside AB	Possible	

**How many scores does the funder require?**

AC of Great Britain	To British Music Information Centre (BMIC)
Scottish AC	Not specified
Welsh AC	To WMIC
AC of Northern Ireland	Not specified
AC of Ireland	1 to ACI: 1 to Irish Centre for Contemporary Music
Eastern AB	1 for loan to potential performers: 1 to BMIC
East Midlands AB	1 to EMAB: 1 to BMIC
London AB	1 tape to LAB: 1 score to BMIC
Northern AB	None
North West AB	1
Southern AB	1 to SAB: 1 to BMIC
South East AB	1 to SEAB: 1 to BMIC
South West AB	To SWAB: 1 to BMIC
West Midlands AB	1 to BMIC
Yorks & Humberside AB	1, which is forwarded by YHAB to BMIC

Misunderstandings apart, composers and commissioners have many well founded criticisms of the commissioning system. These can be divided into two categories:

- those that relate to the procedures for applying for and undertaking a commission
- those that relate to the funders' attitudes to commissioning and the subsequent promotion of the new work.

**2.ii. Criticisms of procedures**

- a. The application criteria are inconsistent from one funding body to the next.
- b. Too often there are unacceptable delays between the submission of the application for funds and notification of its success or failure. The composer is not supposed to start work until confirmation of funding is received, but often has to jump the gun in order to finish the piece in time for the premiere, details of which have been asked for in the application.

- c. The application criteria rarely allow a composer to apply for funds to write a piece for his or her own band or ensemble. (Funds for this purpose are usually applied for by a promoter.)
- d. Too often, known composers who have received support from the same funding body on previous occasions are asked to submit scores and tapes of their work. This is interpreted as ignorance on the part of the officer and the selection panel. (Only a few of the funders add a caveat to their request for materials saying that if the composer is nationally known, none need be submitted.)
- e. The selection panels are currently unable to deal with commissions that will be completed two or three years hence. This applies, in particular, to composers whose time is heavily committed and to festivals and orchestras that plan their programmes years in advance. An agreement in principle to support a particular commission would be helpful. The Arts Councils are generally sympathetic to appeals for long-term commitments, but the Regional Arts Boards tend not to commit themselves more than one year ahead. (In the cases of the Arts Councils it may be that payment is made in the year of the commission and then the commissioner is encouraged to reapply (Arts Council of Great Britain) or that the commission is actually spread over two years (Arts Council of Ireland)).
- f. Selection procedures are too heavily influenced by financial considerations and too little by art. There is too little money to meet the demand and this inevitably leads to decisions based on how much music can be bought for how much money.
- g. Selection panels are under pressure to make decisions at speed and with too little preparation. This leads to bad decisions. One composer suggested to us: **"Currently, the Arts Council of Great Britain operates a commissioning scheme in which in effect strict bureaucratic conditions are simply a means of filtering entries from whose reduced ranks a panel makes a selection, according to its whim. This reduces commissioning to a lottery. It would, I believe, be more acceptable if, under such a system, an actual lottery took place - of passable applications for whatever money is available."**
- h. It is difficult for a composer to obtain a commission unless s/he has already had one.
- i. It is difficult to obtain a commission if your work does not fit a particular stylistic niche.
- j. Women are grossly under-represented among commissioned composers in view of the number of women working as composers.

k. Very few of the funding bodies will accept an application from an orchestra or ensemble wanting to commission its lead player, or conductor, for example. This rules out the founder of an ensemble from receiving funds to write a new piece for that ensemble. In jazz this problem is overcome by the promoter applying for funds to commission the composer to write for the band. One composer wrote to say he had had about 360 performances and broadcasts of 12 pieces in 20 countries in the last 25 years and seven recordings, yet none of these qualified for commission funds because he was both the performer and the composer. (He did however, qualify for an Arts Council of Great Britain bursary.)

l. Some of the information requested by funders is irrelevant and some of the criteria irrational. Most composers have a story to tell that illustrates their dissatisfaction with the system. The anecdote below is ten years old, but it is cited by the composer as a prime example of the 'folly' of the system: **"In 1983 [..... String Quartet] wished to commission my first quartet, but [Regional Arts Association A] would not support this until [the Quartet] could guarantee three performances in the region. Only because [Regional Arts Association B] was less rigid was it possible for Birmingham Chamber Concerts Society to commission the work. Subsequent performances in Leeds, Manchester, Purcell Room and Radio 3 (and others planned for next year) testify to their wisdom and the folly of [Regional Arts Association A] in this matter."**

m. The insistence of some funders on the provision of details of three performances for the unwritten piece, at the time of application, is generally thought to be meaningless. An astonishingly large number of composers and commissioners confirmed that these details are regularly invented and that since representatives of the funding bodies rarely turn up for performances after the premiere (and in some cases do not even attend that), it does not matter. Several commissioners agreed that, if it was a question of risking the success or failure of the application, they would falsify details of future performances. **"If they don't trust us to play the piece, they shouldn't give us the money,"** one suggested. In order to make sense of this criterion for funding, the funding bodies must also take responsibility for its fulfilment.

n. The level of fees, as recommended by the Association of Professional Composers/Composers' Guild of Great Britain guidelines are too low in relation to the amount of time spent writing a piece, however long and whatever the forces. **"Fees bear no relation to the amount of time spent writing music,"** said one composer. Another reported: **"I have heard of a composer who was commissioned to write a 30-minute piece and when he submitted a 25-minute piece some of his fee, which was in any case below the Association of Professional Composers guidelines, was taken back!"**

The argument that fees can be kept low because if the piece is successful the composer will earn more from royalties and music hire fees is not accepted by most composers, not least because the composer has little influence over the exploitation of the work. Composers want to be paid for the production of the music in its own right. There is, however, resigned acceptance that the fees are at a level the commissioner will pay; it is a buyers' market.

**o.** The sum awarded by the funding body is rarely the full amount applied for. There is criticism of the fact that the applicant (whatever the size - symphony orchestra or jazz band or soloist) is expected to raise the balance. A blanket policy in this matter is deemed unreasonable since the balance of the fee is often not raised and the composer receives a lower fee than originally discussed.

**p.** Funding bodies should provide copying costs for unpublished composers.

**q.** Many of the funding bodies send payment for the new work to the commissioner for it to be passed on to the composer. A large number of composers interviewed, and of those who submitted written views, said that this often results in unnecessary delays. Where the composer has to pay a copyist before the final part of the commission fee has been received, any delay can be highly inconvenient. Few composers see any logic in paying the commissioner rather than the composer. We were told of a group in Holland which received funds from the Arts Council of Great Britain to commission a UK-based composer. Payment was converted into guilders and sent to Holland, and converted back to sterling and sent to the composer in Britain, incurring the cost of two currency exchanges and an unnecessary delay. The ACGB now pays the composer directly in cases such as the above, but as inter-European collaborations increase the lesson should not be forgotten.

### **2.iii. Criticisms of funders' attitudes to commissioning**

**a.** The funding bodies are too interested in the creation of new work for its own sake and too unconcerned about the life of that work once it has been composed. There is a large body of work that is rarely performed. Composers believe this is partly due to the fact that the bodies that helped to finance the creation of that work have no coordinated approach to its promotion (and this is in spite of the best efforts of touring schemes dedicated to the promotion of contemporary music, such as the Arts Council of Great Britain's Contemporary Music Network and Ireland's Music Network).

**b.** Some composers, commissioners, publishers and critics believe there should be fewer, better funded commissions and some provision for the promotion of performances of work that have already been premiered. As one composer put

it: **"Too much is lost because there is no body that will take interest or responsibility for promoting performance, broadcast and recording. This is usually left to the limited, tentative and often inefficient approaches of either publishers (of which there are incredibly few) or composers themselves – and it is very unfair of supposedly supportive organisations to leave it to them!"**

c. There should be more encouragement of commissioning by amateur groups (choral societies and music societies), individual patrons and commercial businesses, with a view to making commissioning a much more 'popular' activity.

d. Bearing in mind differences of scale in terms of budgets and clients, all Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards should be facilitating the recording of commissioned work and the dissemination of those recordings. It is widely felt by composers and commissioners that the Arts Council of Great Britain's music panel must reinstate the recording budget in 1994/5.

e. There is despair among composers at the apparent disinterest of the funding bodies in working together to promote the work they fund.

f. Commissioners, promoters, publishers and composers believe that the music information centres could play a key role in the promotion of lesser known composers, but recognise that in order to do this they need larger budgets.

g. Some composers would like more opportunities to be involved in the development of audiences for contemporary music and support the residency and composers-in-association schemes currently in operation. One suggested: **"If composers were made to be more useful to the music industry (ie by seeking more performances of their work and residencies), there would be less need for so much self-conscious and dutiful commissioning. The performances themselves would contribute more funding and encouragement to composers (for presumably that is what the commissioning schemes are largely about)."**

## **2.iv. How accurate are the criticisms?**

### **a. Who does receive commissions?**

It is a fact that a composer is more likely to receive a commission if a commissioner has heard other works or has good reason to believe that the composer can produce the goods (eg on the recommendation of a former tutor). Composers are picked on the basis of their reputation or promise and not on the basis of competing proposals for a particular contract. This system of direct approach from commissioner to composer is frustrating for the composer who is not part of the established circuit. Creating opportunities to have their music

heard is a key task for all composers at the beginning of their careers. Opportunities might include college concerts and showcases, competitions, Society for the Promotion of New Music concerts, promotions by the music information centres, festivals featuring the work of new composers or young composers, and performances by the composer's own band or other bands.

The London factor was raised by many interviewees and respondents to the questionnaire, who believed that opportunities for a relatively untried composer to be noticed are far greater in London than anywhere else in Britain. According to composers who regularly receive commissions, and to those at the beginning of their careers, networking and word of mouth count for a great deal in winning commissions, and the opportunities to network in the capital are much more numerous.

In concert music, the higher education network (whether routed via music college or university) is also important. Teachers of composition regularly feature on selection panels of funding bodies and competitions and while not necessarily favouring their own students, they are more likely to be able to describe their work. Panel members tend to agree that it is very difficult to select unknown composers unless there is extraordinary evidence of their skill. Exactly the same principle holds true in applied music. Composers who come to composition from outside the higher education network or who begin to concentrate on their work as composers later than average (for example, after having had children), tend to find it more difficult to break into the network.

Once established, composers with a publisher may find it an advantage to have the additional weight of the publishing company behind them when seeking commissions, although publishers vary in the extent to which they actively seek new work for their composers. Every new commission means additional outlay for the publisher. While premieres are more prestigious, the promotion of existing works is more profitable.

While the composer may be the commissioner's choice, the influence of the funding bodies – principally the Arts Councils, the Regional Arts Boards and the BBC – in determining levels of popularity and exposure of composers should not be underestimated. The commissioning body knows which composers stand the best chance of receiving a commission fee from the funding bodies and may be less likely to nominate a composer who is unlikely to receive approval. This has been described to us as 'cynical' commissioning: commissioning because it is what is expected, rather than because it makes artistic sense.

A significant number of the interviewees and questionnaire respondents who have served on selection panels admit that panels are more likely to vote for a composer whose work they know than for an unknown. Decisions are also made

on the basis of the likely success of the combination of the commissioner and the composer, and on the likelihood that audiences will respond well. A commission is not solely a transaction in goods for pay. It is an endorsement of the composer.

It should be noted here that a number of composers who have served on selection panels expressed to us their frustration at having made a decision not to support a particular bid for a commission only to find that their decision was later overturned by the officers (the Arts Council of Great Britain states that it is unaware that this has ever occurred). Where a panel is serving in an advisory capacity, the officers are perfectly within their rights to make independent decisions, but the advisers argue that if they have been invited to apply their knowledge and expertise, then their advice as a group should stand.

#### **b. Who falls through the net?**

There was no consistency in responses to a question about groups of composers and styles of music that tend to be excluded from the commissioning process. Suggestions were made by a wide range of interested parties, including women, black composers, older composers, recent graduates, composers without a higher education, composers who fit no definable style, composers of easy-listening music, composers of difficult music, cross-cultural work, multi-media work, electro-acoustic music, folk and improvised work. One composer in Ireland suggested that it was impossible to find a commission for a large orchestral work in that country. Some composers felt that applications from amateur commissioners, such as choral societies, are sometimes considered second-rate, even though their standard of performance is often very high.

It was pointed out that whenever a funding body added a new category, or positively encouraged applications for work by women, for example, the number of applications in that category increased considerably. This is a clear example of the funding opportunity influencing the choice made by the commissioner. (Both the Scottish and Irish Arts Councils are positively encouraging applications from composers of traditional music.)

It is a fact that very few women and very few black, Asian or South Asian composers receive commissions in the classical, jazz or electro-acoustic field. They tend to have a greater presence in traditional music, but the number of commissions in this area is so small that no reliable conclusions can be drawn. The women and Afro-Caribbean and Asian composers interviewed all mentioned the importance of networks which tend to be predominantly male and white. Some added that a higher music education gave them a degree of



access to opportunities that those without that education and its resulting networks did not have.

Several expressed a certain weariness at being picked out again as the token black woman composer or the respectable middle-aged feminist composer: some felt they were asked to make too many decisions on selection panels and that funding bodies should make much greater efforts to identify women and black and Asian composers to take on those responsibilities. One was particularly concerned about hierarchies of "composers who make decisions about other composers" and felt that there should be a much more rapid turnover on selection panels and competition juries.

Two women who were classically trained but compose in a wide range of styles had found that the best way to have their music heard was to set up their own performing groups, although it was not their only reason for doing so. This has given both composers control over the creation and promotion of their work. A composer who has access to her own ensemble also has much greater opportunity to experiment with a new work.

Rightly or wrongly, few composers held the funding bodies responsible for the unequal representation of composers and musical styles. They were more inclined to attribute this to the system that creates and educates composers, and creates and educates audiences. The choice of composer in classical commissions lies with the performer or the promoter. It was felt by some that more needed to be done to promote the music of women, black and Asian composers, older and younger composers to those who make the initial choice: namely the music director, the conductor and the soloists.

### **c. What is wrong with the application procedures?**

Given the uncertainty on the part of composers about the criteria for eligibility and the application procedures used by the Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards, it is worth looking at them in some detail. The schemes have many similarities, and some important differences. This inconsistency can lead to confusion and duplication of effort for applicants.

#### **● Forms**

Every application form looks different, uses different wording and varies in length. This may give the impression that there are more differences in the criteria for selection and application procedures than there actually are. Application forms range from a double-sided sheet asking principally about the proposed commission, other sources of income and the location of performances (eg the Arts Council of Northern Ireland, East Midlands Arts Board, South East

Arts Board, Yorkshire and Humberside Arts Board) to several pages of questions not only about the commission but also supplementary information, such as the constitution of the commissioning body, the composition of its board of management and so on (eg the London Arts Board). A contract form is also sometimes included with the application form.

- **Timing**

The selection panels (where they exist) of the Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards meet between one and four times per year. The timing of the application and decision-making process has been criticised by composers and by commissioners who have experienced long delays between the submission of an application and the notification of the decision. While acknowledging that the funding bodies must limit the number of meetings they can hold in a year, and that some applicants will miss deadlines whenever they fall, the question of timing needs to be considered.

Some funding bodies have also been criticised for responding slowly to requests for guidelines and application forms and for failing to elaborate on the criteria for selection when asked. It has been suggested that if a proposal stands little chance of selection, the officer should inform the applicant promptly, so that efforts can be made to find other sources of funding in the event of the panel turning down the application.

- **Eligibility**

Table 2 lists the different types of composer and commissioner considered by each of the Arts Councils and the Regional Arts Boards. A further criterion for eligibility is that in every case the premiere is expected to take place in the region (unless there is a very good reason for not doing so) and in some cases one or two subsequent performances as well. The reason for this is that the Regional Arts Boards exist to improve the range and quality and volume of artistic activity in their regions. The argument that at least one of the parties involved should be based in the region could be seen as a token gesture in a small country. It also greatly reduces the number of calls on the Regional Arts Boards' funds. It is a process of limitation rather than creation.

- **Selection**

In all music styles covered by the funding bodies the method of choosing between applications for commission funds is based on selection by peers. This system is used by the arts funding bodies, by the trusts that support commissions and by organisations such as the Society for the Promotion of New Music.

Every Arts Council and Regional Arts Board selects the recipients of its commission awards in the absence of the commissioner and the composer. No representations are made to endorse a particular proposal. This is largely due to

a lack of time and resources and we received very little encouragement for the idea that a meeting of funder, commissioner and composer might help the funder to make better decisions. This is largely because of the small sums at stake and the speed with which the selection procedure is undertaken. It is probably also a reflection of the intimacy of the new music world (in all styles), where the members of the selection panel are highly likely to be familiar with most of the applicants for funds. In the eyes of composers at the start of their career, and those who remember the start of their career, this brings with it considerable disadvantage for those composers who are not yet tried and tested.

In almost every case those who choose the recipients of commissions are unpaid. Selectors or advisers therefore have to have sufficient free time, financial resources and commitment to undertake the task. In the case of the arts funding bodies, the officers responsible for this area of work are also responsible for selecting advisers. In some cases the selectors are also members of another panel of the funding body, in others they are a new batch of people and in some cases they are a mixture of the two.

Understandably the officer wants to bring together individuals who are informed about the different types of music they will be assessing and who will work together well as a team. It has been pointed out that many of the leading teachers of composition and composers themselves are at universities and at music colleges, and that selection panels often include them. There is a possibility, it has been suggested, that those who have passed through a particular university or college network are much more likely to be picked out from among the applications. The system of patronage of one's own students exists in all walks of life and is certainly not unique to composition.

Interviewees for this study, and respondents to questionnaires, have included a number of composers who have served or are still serving as members of selection panels for an arts council, a regional arts board, a trust or a competition jury. None could cite a satisfactory method of selection and many expressed their frustration at the current system: **"I served on the Arts Council of Great Britain commissioning panel about two years ago. We had requests for about £350,000 of fees and we had about £30,000 to give. The morning was spent cutting out many extremely good commission ideas and ending up with a dozen or so commissions, most of them with severely reduced amounts. It was a most depressing three hours."**

The issues here relate to the regularity with which the same composers sit on panels; the tendency for those panels to be predominantly white, male and middle class; the speed with which those panels have to work; the tendency for panels to be reluctant to choose composers with whose work they are unfamiliar.

There may be some truth in the notion that if advisers are established composers, they may tend to choose other established composers. It has been suggested that advertisements asking for nominations for advisers to Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards should be widely circulated by the Association of Professional Composers, the Composers' Guild of Great Britain and the Music Information Centres, and in the music press. It is a widely held view that advisers should be selected from a much broader range of composers, conductors and performers, of different musical experience and taste, age, gender, and race than is currently the case. There is concern that the same people are too regularly invited to sit on selection panels; that they do not always have sufficient knowledge to judge all applications. There is also a view that advisers should receive compensation for their attendance at meetings, which should be compulsory, once the adviser has made the commitment.

## 2.v. Life beyond the commission

Music lives when it is heard and read, through performance, recording and publication. The current commissioning system typically asks applicants to secure two or three performances of the new work and to cite the dates and venues of those performances. In practice it seems that there is little monitoring of the work beyond the premiere. If the support of funding bodies for commissions is small, their support for the subsequent dissemination of the work is even smaller.

The over-riding criticism of commissioning schemes made by composers and publishers is that too many of the funding bodies and commissioners treat the act of commissioning as an end in itself. Composers argue that far too little thought is given to the life of a work after the premiere. One composer wrote: **"There are too many pieces around that exist briefly, only for the sake of novelty and the first performance syndrome."** Some funders would argue that the composers themselves could do more to secure performances of their work.

The cult of the premiere militates against the performance of existing work. No one challenges the assumption that premieres are special, and for a number of reasons: they may receive press coverage, they are attractive to sponsors, and they are unique. While all of these have value, their absence cannot be considered a deterrent to further performances. Press coverage of new work tends to focus on metropolitan premieres and festivals. Many, many premieres go un-noted by the press. Reviews are read by a very small proportion of the population and are unlikely to be considered the main focus of publicity in relation to the sponsored event. This has more bearing when the composer or soloist or conductor has 'star status' and features are written in connection with the premiere.

The argument that premieres draw the critics is only true in the case of some of the better known composers and performers and in some of the larger cities. The argument that a regional audience should hear the piece first is also weak, since the regions are all large and only a very small number of people in the region will attend the premiere. The argument that where there is a sponsor from within the region it will expect a regional premiere is more acceptable.

If the funding bodies, the commissioners, the performing organisations and the publishers agree that the purpose of music is for it to be played and heard, then they all need to look again at how they promote and disseminate the music they are helping to create. This is not to deny the hugely important promotional work undertaken by the Contemporary Music Network (in Britain) and the Music Network (in Ireland), without which concerts of contemporary music would be even more likely to be heard only in major cities.

In every form of music – classical, electro-acoustic, jazz, traditional, non-western – commissioning is just one element of the development of the contemporary repertoire. To make sense of the funds they invest in commissions, the funding bodies should be looking to support a package that includes the commission fee, the production of performing materials, the participation of the composer in rehearsals, the premiere and its associated costs, and the recording of the premiere. The financial commitment will be greater and unless budgets are dramatically increased or funds can be found from other sources (notably private patronage) it may mean fewer commissions, but it is likely to ensure a longer life for those fewer commissions.

Different types of music face different problems at different points in the cycle of realisation. For symphony orchestras, for example, the cost of commissioning is not the major obstacle. It is the associated costs of rehearsing and mounting second, third or even first performances where balancing the books takes precedence in the tussle between bums on seats and audience or repertoire development. For commissioners and composers of electro-acoustic music, the issue is one of equipment. Much of the best computer equipment is housed in the universities and while the prices are coming down, there is still a major difficulty, especially for smaller groups, in gaining access to diffusion equipment for use in performance of the work.

The funding bodies already support a number of organisations to promote new music, including the Society for the Promotion of New Music, Sonic Arts Network, the music information centres, the Music Touring Network (Dublin) and the Contemporary Music Network (an in-house initiative of the Arts Council of Great Britain), but their work has no overall coordination. Their efforts are informed and energetic, but piecemeal.

For commissions funded by public bodies, the audience is the ultimate arbiter. In order to choose, however, the audience has to be presented with opportunities to see and hear a range of pieces to choose between. Every advocate of contemporary music has anecdotes about the excitement on new faces in the hall, and about audiences hungry for more, but these are not enough to justify even the small amount the funding bodies currently invest in commissions, without a parallel strategy for promoting the work.

## CHAPTER 3

### OPTIONS

The managers of the music commission schemes have a choice: to leave things as they are and see what happens, or to make changes in the operation of those schemes which will make more sense of their investment, for the benefit of the composers, the commissioners, the funders and the audiences.

If the sums currently invested in commissioning are to be better exploited and if the music that is being written is to have a fairer hearing, music organisations, individual promoters, venues, performers and funders need to work together to nurture and promote new work. It is philosophically incoherent to offer financial support for the creation of work at the 'cutting edge', which might not otherwise see the light of day, only to throw the new born into the market in the hope that the language of innovation will somehow become the vernacular.

The failure to see or treat commissioning as one aspect of music-making, as part of the cycle of production, short-changes the composer, the music, the players and the audience. There is little point in improving the commissioning process if players continue to receive poorly copied parts, if the work is inadequately rehearsed, half-heartedly promoted and unimaginatively presented.

In deciding how to improve the experience of commissioning and increasing its impact on players and audiences, the funders and promoters of commissions need to answer a few questions:

1. We live in a plural cultural environment. Is the music that is being commissioned today responding sufficiently to this fact?
2. Commissioning is one way to pay a composer to write a piece of music. When is a commission the best way and when is it inappropriate?
3. Are there certain types of music the funding bodies value more highly than others?
4. Within the new unified funding system, to what extent are the funding bodies prepared to work more closely with each other?

5. Do the funders think the creation of music is sufficiently important to reallocate some of the money they currently invest in the performance of music to commissioning and the associated costs of rehearsal, the production of materials and recording of the new work?

### **Summary of main options**

- a. Information about existing schemes must be more widely disseminated.
- b. The Regional Arts Boards and Arts Councils application forms and criteria for commission funds should be standardised as far as possible.
- c. The production of a piece of music must be seen as a process not a creative end in itself.
- d. The funding bodies need to agree common guidelines for the selection of advisers and common terms and conditions for those advisers. The representation on these panels needs to be broadened.
- e. The Regional Arts Boards and Arts Councils should, as far as possible, standardise their contracts with the composer and commissioner taking due account of variations in the law.
- f. Commissioners and funders should agree to observe the Association of Professional Composers/Composers' Guild of Great Britain guidelines.
- g. Funders of commissions should make allowance for the cost of a DAT recording of the premiere of a studio performance of a new work in addition to the composers fee.
- h. Revenue clients of the Regional Arts Boards and Arts Councils must be encouraged to promote work commissioned with funds from these funding bodies.
- i. Channels of dissemination and promotion for new work need to be developed which take it beyond the one or two performance mark.
- j. The funding bodies should publish catalogues of commissions funded and retain, for promotional purposes, one score and one recording of every work commissioned.
- k. Funding bodies should encourage partnerships between their clients.



- l.** There is a need to develop and nurture new audiences, live and recorded.
- m.** The Arts Councils should attempt to establish a much closer working relationship with the national broadcasting companies.
- n.** There needs to be an increase in networking between the Regional Arts Boards and the Arts Councils to exploit their commissions further. The Regional Arts Boards might consider the development of a touring network at an inter-regional level. Current initiatives in co-commissioning between Regional Arts Boards and the Arts Councils should be developed.
- o.** The feasibility of 'percent for commissioning music' should be further investigated.
- p.** The Music Information Centres should consider a joint scheme to promote corporate and private patronage of commissions.
- q.** Residencies and associateships for composers should be developed further and lessons learned from experience of these schemes to date.
- r.** The Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards might consider earmarking a part of their commission funds to award three-year contracts to a minimum of three music organisations in the region to commission six works in the course of the three-year period.
- s.** Composers should be eligible to apply for commission funds for the commissioning of their own work.
- t.** The Regional Arts Boards and Arts Councils should consider introducing fees for work already written.
- u.** Financial incentives should be introduced to encourage second and third tours of commissioned work.
- v.** The introduction of the single European market may affect the working conditions of composers and this area should be the subject of a further study.

Some of the options that follow will cost money to implement; others require no more than a reorganisation of existing resources. Where additional funds will be required, an estimated sum is given at the end of the paragraph.

### **3.i. Improving existing schemes**

#### **a. Publicity**

The commissioning schemes of *all* funding bodies have a low public profile. Some of the music officers are ambivalent about publicising these schemes more widely. While they want to broaden the range of applications received, they fear that if they publicise the schemes more effectively they will be unable to meet the demand. The fact is that until the existence of the schemes is widely advertised the range of applications will remain narrow and the number of applications will remain small.

Joint advertisements by all funding bodies in nationally distributed magazines showing deadlines for each region (and country) might help to increase the range and number of applications. Such advertisements could also be placed in specialist publications such as the Sonic Arts Network newsletter, the Society for the Promotion of New Music's *New:notes*, Sound Sense's *Sounding Board*, the Association of Professional Composers newsletter *Professional Composer*, the Scottish Music Information Centre newsletter *Music Current*, the Contemporary Music Centre's *New Music News* and so on.

#### **b. Information**

Funding bodies and composers' organisations wishing to encourage first-time commissioners should provide basic information on *how to* commission. In 1989, for example, Sonic Arts Network produced a booklet on how to commission electro-acoustic music. The Association of Professional Composers has recently produced an excellent booklet on commissioning all styles of music. This should be made widely available through the music information centres, music colleges and university music departments, and organisations such as the National Federation of Music Societies, British Association of Symphonic Bands and Wind Ensembles and the Society for the Promotion of New Music.

#### **c. Application forms and criteria**

The Regional Arts Board and Arts Council of Great Britain application forms and criteria for commission funds should be standardised as far as possible (with supplements to take into account regional or special priorities in a particular year, eg work by Asian composers). This would simplify the procedure for applicants and create no extra work for the funding body. It would also make inter-regional collaborations and exchanges of information more feasible.

Funders need to agree the number of performances required, the eligibility of composers, commissioners and styles, approaches to part-funding, to whom payment should be made, whether or not funds are available for copying, rehearsals, recording and so on.

Appendix 5 presents a standard application form for use by the Regional Arts Boards.

#### **d. Selection procedures**

The funding bodies organise their selection procedures differently and will continue to do so, but basic guidelines common to all funding bodies would be useful, namely:

- The funding bodies need to make genuine efforts to bring in a wide selection of people to act as advisers (as distinct from panel members - where these exist). Performers, programmers and promoters should be involved.
- Advisers should be paid for their time (as is the case at the Crafts Council) and committed to attend a certain number of meetings (although under its current charter the Arts Council of Great Britain cannot pay advisers, the current devolution of control to the Welsh and Scottish Arts Councils will involve a rewriting of the current charter and the possibility of change in this area). Time should be allocated to the thorough consideration of applications both before and during selection meetings. This should help to contribute to a sounder decision-making process.
- Advisers should not sit for more than three consecutive years, after which this should be followed by a break of at least one year.
- Advisers' advice should not be over-ruled by officers unless there are exceptional circumstances which are explained to the advisers.

#### **e. Contracts**

Contracts issued by the funding bodies to the commissioner and to the composer should be standardised (with amendments as necessary to take account of English, Scottish and Irish law).

The contract should include provision for:

- Direct payment to the composer\* in two or more instalments - one on signature of the contract and one on delivery of the piece.
- An undertaking on the part of the commissioner to arrange at least one rehearsal of the new work with the composer in attendance. The funder might consider making a contribution to the rehearsal costs of smaller ensembles and bands.
- An undertaking on the part of the commissioner to arrange at least three performances of the new work within two years of the delivery of the score. We acknowledge that it may be more difficult for some festivals and for amateur groups to fulfil this condition. There should be no obligation at this stage to list dates and venues. The performances need not be by the commissioning body. In other than exceptional circumstances (eg a piece is a disaster acknowledged by funder and commissioner) failure to promote three performances should be penalised by the deduction of a nominal amount from the following year's grant (in the case of revenue clients) and suspension from the commissioning scheme for one year (for project clients). The funding body might consider guaranteeing the three performances against loss or sharing any loss with the promoter.
- Where the composer has no publisher or where no other source of funds is available, contracts should include an undertaking on the part of the funder to provide copying costs in advance of the final instalment of the fee, with the balance payable on presentation of the copyist's receipts.
- With regard to copyright, the Copyright Design and Patents Act 1988 provides that the 'first owner' of a copyright in a musical work is the 'author' (that is, the composer). Therefore, in the absence of a written agreement, signed by the composer, containing an assignment of the copyright in favour of the commissioner, the copyright will remain vested in, and be a potentially important and valuable asset of, the composer.

*\*We strongly recommend that fees are paid direct to the composer. From an administrative point of view alone, this could save money. If £1,000 is paid to the commissioner and the composer charges VAT, the commissioner is liable to pay the composer and an additional £175.*

#### **f. Fees and costs**

Commissioners and funders should agree to observe the Association of Professional Composers/Composers' Guild of Great Britain guidelines.

As mentioned above, a contribution towards copying costs should be included in commission awards to unpublished composers. Where publishers refuse to publish, the funding bodies should consider making a contribution, in return for a share of the music hire fees.

We applaud the London Arts Board's practice of allocating £250 from every commission over £3,000 to make a DAT recording of the premiere of a studio performance of a new work. We believe, however, that the allowance for the recording should be in addition to the composer's fee and not deducted from it. Other funding bodies should consider following this example and perhaps contracting a funded studio in the region to undertake the work. In all that concerns the above, the rights of the performers and composers in respect of rights and royalties needs to be considered.

Funders should consider staggering payments for large commissions, due two or three years ahead in order to prevent budgets being swallowed up by large commissions.

To eradicate the problem of partial payment of composers, some funders may want to consider the pros and cons of paying 100% of the fee. Where they decide against this, they must monitor the progress being made by the commissioner in raising the balance of the fee and insist that where the commissioner is paying part of the fee, this is paid before the funding body's payment is released.

We commend the system of the Arts Council in Ireland which pays fees on a sliding scale, according to the perceived ability of the commissioner to pay the balance.

#### **g. Promotion of the commission**

If the funding body opts to be more involved in the promotion of the work it commissions, it might consider the following measures:

- Invite every revenue client to adopt a commissioning policy, spelling out why that client commissions and how it promotes those commissions.
- Where the funding body supports touring companies and networks, these should be encouraged to promote work commissioned with funds from that funding body.
- Encourage funded venues to promote work commissioned by that funding body.

- Publish catalogues of commissions funded and lodge them with the music information centres. The Sound Investment scheme's portfolio and the Contemporary Music Centre in Dublin's *Irish Composers* folder are good models (see Appendix 6).
- Retain one score and one recording of every work commissioned for consultation by potential promoters, performers and other funding bodies.
- Encourage partnerships between local commissioners/performers and subsidised recording studios.
- Look for opportunities to work with local and regional television and radio with a view to promoting commissions and raising the profile of composers, performing groups and venues.
- The Arts Councils should attempt to establish a closer working relationship with the national broadcasting companies, with a view to promoting commissioned work, while remaining aware of concentrating too much power in too few hands. In Ireland (north and south) this relationship already exists, and the BBC already works to some extent with the Arts Councils. The new music editor for Radio 3 is invited to attend commission panel meetings, so that he knows what commissions will be coming up a year or two ahead: the Arts Council of Great Britain is less well informed about the BBC's plans. We suggest that the Arts Councils for England, Scotland and Wales and BBC Radio 3 should discuss the possibility of regular broadcasts of works commissioned with Arts Councils' funding.

#### **h. Extended copyright**

There is currently a move to harmonise copyright throughout Europe at 70 years. The possibility of extending this by, for example, 15-25 years should be explored with a view to the revenue from the additional period going to support new music and/or its composers.

#### **i. Links between the funding bodies**

The commissioning process is currently very fragmented. In 1992, for the first time, the four UK Arts Councils jointly funded a work by Peter Maxwell Davies for a national education project devised by the Association of British Orchestras, the 'Turn of the Tide' project.

We can see many advantages and few disadvantages in closer collaborations between the funding bodies at both Arts Council and Regional Arts Board level.

It has been suggested during the course of this study that the Regional Arts Boards' commissioning budgets are too small to justify the cost of their own administration. While acknowledging that the different approaches to commissioning by the Regional Arts Boards and their varying priorities and budgets may disadvantage some composers in some Regional Arts Board areas, we remain strongly in favour of the retention of commission budgets by the Regional Arts Boards. It is our conviction that the Regional Arts Board music officers have a much better knowledge of the potential for musical partnerships and promotions in their regions than a central Arts Council could have. We do however advocate an increase in networking between the Regional Arts Boards to exploit their commissions more.

Between them the Regional Arts Boards support around 200 commissions per year. Few of them are widely heard outside their respective regions. At present, a commissioner who plans to tour to more than three regions is eligible to apply to the Arts Council of Great Britain for funding for the commission.

We suggest that the Regional Arts Boards should keep each other informed of commissions they are supporting, with a view to promoting these commissions in other parts of the country and welcoming work from other regions into their own area. Each Regional Arts Board would thereby raise the profile of the work it helps to fund and the range of work available to audiences in the region. A scheme might be developed in consultation with the Contemporary Music Network, the Society for the Promotion of New Music and the Scottish Music Information Centre and independent agencies, such as Serious Speakout, to establish a touring network at inter-regional level.

The Regional Arts Boards might also consider more co-commissions between two or more Regional Arts Boards. The only foreseeable difficulty here is the location of the premiere. Co-commissioning would enable a Regional Arts Board to fund work that would otherwise be too expensive; co-commissions prevent too narrow a focus within the region; they may attract more publicity; they are likely to be heard by a greater number of people; and they promote the sharing of ideas and experience. South East Arts Board's guidelines to commissioning bodies encourage co-commissions.

## **j. Music Information Centres**

The Music Information Centres currently have differing degrees of success in their roles as promoters of, and disseminators of information on, contemporary music. The funding bodies need to reassess the potential of these and other similar infrastructural organisations and their potential for development.

### **3.ii. New ideas**

#### **a. Private and corporate patronage**

The Arts Councils, the Crafts Council and the Regional Arts Boards have all lobbied for the introduction of percent for art policies, whereby a percentage of capital budgets (for new buildings and refurbishments) is allocated to commissioning a work of art. It might also be worth looking at the potential for commissioning music to celebrate the opening of a new building or the refurbishment of an old one. In Dublin the Contemporary Music Centre recently encouraged the university authorities to commission a piece of music to commemorate the opening of a new hall.

The Music Information Centres should consider meeting to devise a joint scheme to promote corporate and private patronage of commissions.

#### **b. Residencies and associateships**

The idea of appointing composers to work for a fixed period of time with an orchestra has begun to take off in the UK (with encouragement from the Arts Council of Great Britain). Residencies or associateships can provide composers with an opportunity to hear his or her work in progress and to establish a relationship with the orchestra, which is then more likely to feel a sense of ownership in the new work. It can also lead to opportunities for the composer to meet audiences and help to introduce new work. Some composers in residence or association also advise on programming.

Experience to date suggests that the residencies and associateships are worthwhile investments in the development of public and performer appreciation of new music.

Awards could be made available for composers and ensembles or groups to meet and work together at the ideas stage, ie if a group has an idea that it may want to collaborate with a particular composer or, vice versa, an award could be



made available to cover travel, subsistence and a number of days work for the composer.

The Regional Arts Boards might also consider co-commissions between two or more Regional Arts Boards. The only foreseeable difficulty here is the location of the premiere. Co-commissioning would enable a Regional Arts Board to fund work that would otherwise be too expensive; co-commissions prevent too narrow a focus within the region; they may attract more publicity; they are likely to be heard by a greater number of people; and they promote the sharing of ideas and experience.

### **c. Contract commissions**

The Arts Councils and Regional Arts Boards might consider earmarking a part of their commission funds to award three-year contracts to a minimum of three music organisations in the region (in the case of the Regional Arts Boards) to commission six works in the course of the three-year period. The commissioner would not have to come back to the funder to approve the choice of composer. This would give the commissioner greater freedom to seek out interesting new composers and to book busier composers to write a piece within the following three years.

Groups would compete for these contracts, necessitating their commitment from the outset. Selection would take place at interview.

The contract would include funds to cover a limited amount of rehearsal time and copying costs.

*Estimated additional cost to each funding body: £30,000 - £40,000.*

### **d. Self commissioning**

There are few opportunities for a composer to apply to a funding body for funds to commission him/herself. Outside the classical music field, it is common for a composer to be a performer also. Many start their own groups to play their music. Provided that the quality of work is high, we can see no reason for composers who perform their own work to be excluded from commission schemes. The same condition of one public performance should apply and the fee should not be paid until the performance has taken place. The Meet the Composer/Commissioning Scheme in the USA allows for performer/composer to receive commission funds to no apparent ill effect. Also in the Republic of

Ireland a composer can apply for funds to write a work for his or her own group.

**e. Payment for work already written**

There are no sources of public funding to which a soloist or ensemble can apply to pay for work already written by (but not commissioned from) a composer. Some of the trusts might consider such a payment and the Eastern Orchestral Board is offering funding to promoters to include work by living composers in their programmes. It makes neither artistic nor economic sense to ignore most of the work that is written once it has had its premiere. The Australia Performing Arts Board operates a scheme that provides a first use fee, payable to the composer and comparable in size to a commission fee, for works completed within the last five years, but never publicly performed. The funding bodies might consider introducing a similar scheme.

*Estimated cost: will depend upon the number of first use fees offered. The fee should be based on the sum that would have been payable had the piece been commissioned (ie calculated on length, instrumentation etc).*

**f. Composers' stipends**

A stipend for composers provided through public funds is currently available in a number of countries, including Norway, Sweden, Finland and Ireland. These are more generous versions of the Arts Council of Great Britain's composers' bursaries (now renamed the Research and Development Fund). The aim is to award a small number of composers a sum of money to pay for 'creative time'. There is no obligation on the composer to produce a piece of music for performance. Recently both the Arts Foundation and the Paul Hamlyn Foundation have introduced artists bursaries which in the short term at least are available to composers. This is a welcome recognition of the stipend principle.

**g. Wider concerns**

This report looks at the process of commissioning in the UK and the Republic of Ireland. There is however, an increasing need, and an increasing acknowledgement of the need to examine the process of commissioning in the wider context of the European Community. The resources need to be found to undertake this work.

## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1**    **The Association of Professional Composers and the Composers' Guild of Great Britain: fee guidelines for serious music commissions in respect of 1994/95**
- Appendix 2**    **The Association of Professional Composers/Composers' Guild: commissioning contract**
- Appendix 3**    **Composers' Joint Council recommended rates for broadcast commissions**
- Appendix 4**    **New Music Commissions Scheme, Arts Council of Ireland: fee guidelines**
- Appendix 5**    **Suggested standard application form for commission funding for use by Regional Arts Boards**
- Appendix 6**    **Extracts from the promotional folder, *Irish Composers*, produced by the Contemporary Music Centre, Dublin**
- Appendix 7**    **Extract from the Music Publishers' Association's submission to the Arts Council of Great Britain, 1989**

## APPENDIX 1

### **The Association of Professional Composers and the Composers' Guild of Great Britain: fee guidelines for serious music commissions in respect of 1994/95**

1. Solo/Duo Works (not including works for piano, harp and keyboard which are rated in category 2)  
£105 - £140 per minute
2. A Cappella Choral Work or Work for 3 - 9 players  
£115 - £225 per minute
3. Large Chamber Ensemble 10-20 players  
£155 - £240 per minute
4. Chamber Orchestra  
£200 - £290 per minute
5. Orchestral Works  
£255 - £420 per minute
6. Orchestral Works with Soloist(s) and/or Chorus  
£290 - £460 per minute
7. Electronic Music  
£140 - £210 per minute (compositional element only)
8. Instrumental/Vocal Works with Tape  
These should be charged at the rates recommended for the appropriate category of work, plus 50% of the above quoted rate for preparation of the tape
9. Opera - Grand or Chamber  
This should relate to the recommended fees for orchestra/choral works. If an opera is intended to have three acts of 45 minutes each, a commissioning fee should be commensurate with the comparable length of orchestral/choral music plus an appropriate amount for producing a piano score. It should be understood that the libretto must be considered separately

**NB:**

- a. The lower end of each of the above bands is intended for less established composers. The upper figure is a medium rather than a maximum.
- b. If the duration of a commissioned work in categories 4,5,6,7 and 8 is to exceed 30 minutes (or in the case of 9, 60 minutes), we suggest that, beyond this point, the fee need not be calculated on a per minute basis and that these guidelines be regarded as a basis for discussion only.
- c. We are aware that commission fees are already being negotiated in respect of 1995/6 and would suggest that, in those cases, the above fees should be increased along the lines of current inflation.

The Association of Professional Composers. The Composers' Guild of Great Britain.  
34 Hanway Street, London W1P 9DE Tel: 071-436 0919 (APC) Tel: 071-436 0001 (CGGB)  
FAX: 071 436 1913

## APPENDIX 2

### The Association of Professional Composers/Composers' Guild of Great Britain: commissioning contract

THIS CONTRACT is between.....  
(hereinafter referred to as THE COMMISSIONER) and  
.....  
(hereinafter referred to as THE COMPOSER)

1.(a) THE COMMISSIONER hereby undertakes to pay to THE COMPOSER a fee of  
£.....(plus VAT if applicable) for the provision of an original composition  
(hereinafter called the WORK) of.....minutes' duration for.....  
.....  
.....

1.(b) Title of WORK (if known).....  
Title of text and name of author (if applicable) .....  
If a copyright text is being used THE COMPOSER will obtain permission for such use.

1.(c) Details of first performance(s) (if known):  
Date(s).....  
Performers(s).....  
Venue.....

2. THE COMPOSER warrants that to the best of his/her knowledge:

- (a) the WORK is an original composition
- (b) THE COMPOSER is the owner thereof
- (c) THE COMPOSER is authorised to enter into this Agreement

3. At least 50% of the fee to be paid on the signing of this Agreement and the remainder upon delivery of the completed full score to THE COMMISSIONER (or, if applicable, THE COMPOSER'S publisher).

4. THE COMPOSER undertakes, using all reasonable efforts, to provide the completed WORK no later than.....otherwise THE COMMISSIONER may be withdrawn by THE COMMISSIONER. However, with the written agreement of both parties, a new delivery date may be set.

5.(a) The original manuscript shall remain the property of THE COMPOSER. THE COMMISSIONER shall have the right to receive one copy of the WORK.

5.(b) The cost of copying orchestral/instrumental/vocal parts shall be the responsibility of THE COMMISSIONER unless THE COMPOSER proposes otherwise.

5.(c) If the cost of preparing the material is to be borne by THE COMMISSIONER no hire fee is chargeable for the use of these parts for the first performance.

5.(d) THE COMPOSER shall retain ownership of these parts.

5.(e) Payment at minimum Musicians' Union Arrangers' rates shall be made by THE COMMISSIONER for the provision of any additional material or arrangement from THE COMPOSER.

6. All world rights whatsoever in the WORK remain the property of THE COMPOSER subject to the terms of his/her membership of PRS and MCPS. However, the exception to this is THE COMMISSIONER'S right to give or promote the first performance of the WORK, provided that this takes place on a date not later than.....after which date THE COMPOSER is free to arrange the first performance elsewhere, in which case all material will be returned to THE COMPOSER free of charge. However, with the written agreement of both parties, a new date for the first performance may be set.

7. THE COMPOSER is free to offer the WORK for publication.

8. THE COMPOSER here asserts his moral rights in the WORK as defined under ss.77 and 80 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988.

9. This Agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of England and the Courts of England and Wales shall be the Court of Jurisdiction.

Signed by.....

Of.....  
THE COMMISSIONER

and

.....  
Of.....  
THE COMPOSER

On.....  
DATE

---

# COMPOSERS JOINT COUNCIL

*The Association of Professional Composers  
The British Academy of Songwriters, Composers and Authors  
The Composers Guild of Great Britain  
The Incorporated Society of Musicians  
The Musicians Union*

All communications to:- The Secretary, 34 Hanway Street, London W1P 9DE. Tel: 01-436 0919

## COMPOSERS JOINT COUNCIL RECOMMENDED RATES FOR BROADCAST COMMISSIONS

### *Rates*

The rates set out below are recommended by the Composers Joint Council for music commissioned for TV and satellite programmes. Rates for radio, and for children's and schools programmes are two-thirds of the TV rates. The minimum figures apply to young or unknown composers and the upper figures relate to more experienced composers. High profile composers can expect to attract a higher rate.

These rates are effective from 1 April 1992.

### *Composition Fees*

These figures relate to the compositional element only. Fees for orchestration, arranging and electronic realisation should be paid separately.

**Incidental Music** (to include stings on a pro rata basis): £42 - £130 per minute

**Title Music** (including programme and promotional ident): £420 minimum

### *Notes:*

1. The addition of lyrics attracts a separate fee.
2. No reduction in fees if either only opening or only closing music is required.
3. Variants requiring an additional creative element (other than re-orchestration) should be treated as a new composition.

### *Attendance Payment*

A composer required to attend for consultation, viewing or recording/dubbing sessions etc. (other than the initial consultation), should receive an attendance fee and reasonable expenses.

### *Credits*

All composers specially commissioned should receive a programme credit, even where a moral rights waiver is included in the commissioning contract.

### *Demo Tapes*

A composer who is asked to produce a specially composed demo tape should be paid a minimum of £200 to cover expenses. This payment does not apply to showreel tapes or unsolicited demo tapes.

### *Composers Joint Council*

The Composers Joint Council is the representative body for composer organisations. Its constituent organisations are the Association of Professional Composers, the British Academy of Songwriters, Composers and Authors, the Composers Guild of Great Britain, the Incorporated Society of Musicians and the Musicians' Union.

### *Addresses*

Association of Professional Composers, 34 Hanway Street, London W1P 9DE, tel: 071-436 0919

BASCA, 34 Hanway Street, London W1P 9DE, tel: 071-436 2261

Composers Guild of Great Britain, 34 Hanway Street, London W1P 9DE, tel: 071-436 0007

Incorporated Society of Musicians, 10 Stratford Place, London W1N 9AE, tel: 071-629 4413

Musicians' Union, 60-62 Clapham Road, London SW9 0JJ. tel: 071-582 5566

## APPENDIX 4

### New Music Commissions Scheme, Arts Council of Ireland: fee guidelines

#### NEW MUSIC COMMISSIONS SCHEME

#### ARTS COUNCIL FEE GUIDELINES

The Arts Council wishes to ensure that composers receive adequate remuneration for their work. The Council believes that the fees detailed below represent the absolute minimum payment a composer should receive for specific work and the Council will not consider applications for assistance under the NMCS when the composers' proposed fee is less than these. The Council will review this scale of fees periodically, and details of fees are always available from the Music Officer. Fees are expressed in £/minute. These fees will apply in 1992.

CATEGORY OF WORK	FEE PER MINUTE (£)
1. Orchestral with soloist/choir	225
2. Orchestral	210
3. Chamber Orchestra	150
4. Large Chamber Ensemble	125
5. Small Chamber Ensemble (less than 10 members) or a capella choir	95
6. Solo/Duo	85
7. Opera	200
8. Electronic	100
9. Instrumental/Vocal with Tape	95



## APPENDIX 5

### **Suggested standard application form for commission funding for use by Regional Arts Boards**

The wording below is based on forms currently used by some of the Regional Arts Boards. The aim is to standardise the basic information that applicants are asked to provide.

---

#### **Summary of information to be completed by the funding body**

1. Grant requested from this funding body
  2. Date by which commissioner must have a decision
  3. Date by which piece must be completed
  4. Proposed date of premiere
  5. Commissioner
  6. Composer
  7. Performer
- 

#### **1. The Commissioner**

1.i. Name of the commissioner (individual or organisation)

1.ii. Address

Telephone

Fax

1.iii. Name and role of the person completing this form

1.iv. Please give the deadline by which you need a decision from this funding body, in order to proceed with the commission.

---

#### **2. The Composer**

2.i. The name of the composer to be commissioned

2.ii. Address

Telephone

Fax

2.iii. The name of the composer's agent (if applicable)

2.iv. Address

Telephone

Fax

2.v. The name of the composer's publisher (if applicable) and name of contact

2.vi. Do you expect that this work will be assigned to this publisher? Yes/No

2.vii. Is the composer a member of the PRS or equivalent body? Yes/No

2.viii. Please enclose a recording and/or score of the composer's recent work, which will be returned to you once your application has been considered.

---

### 3. The work to be commissioned

3.i. Date by which the completed work is required

a. The score

b. The parts

3.ii. Working title of the piece (this is for purposes of identification only)

3.iii. Please describe the musical style of the proposed work, eg jazz, electro-acoustic, traditional

3.iv. Instrumentation (number and type, including all instruments and voices)

3.v. Expected duration of the work

3.vi. Will there be written score Yes/No

3.vii. If not, what form will the finished work take? eg tape, improvisation

---

### 4. The performer

4.i. What is the name of the performer/group/company expected to premiere this work?

4.ii. Where and when is the work to be premiered?

4.iii. What provision have you made for the rehearsal of this work?

4.iv. Do you expect to record this work?

4.v. What plans have you made to promote further performances of this work? (Please note that funds for commissions are granted in the full expectation that the completed work will receive the greatest possible exposure)

---

**5. Finance**

5.i. What is the proposed fee to the composer (excluding VAT, copying and other costs)?

5.ii. What is the estimated cost of producing one copy of the score and one set of parts?

5.iii. What is the anticipated cost of recording the premiere?

5.v. (For electro-acoustic/electronic music applications only) What are the anticipated electronic/studio costs?

5.vi. What are the anticipated rehearsal costs, prior to the premiere?

5.vii. Taking the above into account, what is the total anticipated cost of commissioning the work and preparing it for performance?

5.ix. Sum required from this funding body

5.x. Funds secured from all other sources

---

## **APPENDIX 6**

**Extracts from the promotional folder, *Irish Composers*, produced by the Contemporary Music Centre, Dublin**

# Irish Composers\*

Agnew, Elaine	1968-	Holohan, Michael	1956-
Alcorn, Michael	1962-	Hughes, Herbert	1882-1937
Armstrong, David	1927-1992	Hurley, Donal	1950-
• Barry, Gerald	1952-	Hynes, Oliver	1946-
Bax, Sir Arnold	1883-1953	• Ingoldsby, Marian	1965-
Beckett, Brian	1950-	• Johnston, Fergus	1959-
Beckett, Walter	1914-	Kelly, Denise	1954-
Bell, Derek		Kelly, Mary M.	1957-
Bodley, Seóirse	1933-	Kelly, T. C.	1917-1985
• Boydell, Brian	1917-	Kilgallen, Anne	1960-
Boyle, Ina	1889-1967	• Kinsella, John	1932-
Brennan, John Wolf	1954-	Larchet, John	1884-1967
• Buckley, John	1951-	Macdonald, Alec	1948-
Byers, David	1947-	• McGlynn, Michael	1964-
Byrne, John	1930	McLachlan, John	1964-
Campbell, William	1961	McNulty, Daniel	1920-
Catherwood, David	1956-	• Martin, Philip	1947-
Clarke, Rhona	1958-	Mawby, Colin	1936-
Coghill, Rhoda	1903-	May, Frederick	1911-1985
Collins, Paul	1965-	Mills, Alan	1964-
• Corcoran, Frank	1944-	Moeran, E. J.	1894-1950
Cullivan, Tom	1939-	• Morris, David	1948-
Davey, Shaun	1948-	Nelson, Havelock	1917-
• De Barra, Séamas	1955-	O'Connell, Kevin	1958-
• De Bromhead, Jerome	1945-	Ó Duinn, Proinnsias	1941-
Deale, Edgar	1902-	Ó Gallchobhair, Éamonn	1910-1982
• Deane, Raymond	1953-	• O'Leary, Jane	1946-
Doherty, Jim	1939-	• O'Leary, Martin	1963-
• Doyle, Roger	1949-	Ó Riada, Séan	1931-1971
Duff, Arthur	1899-1956	Ó Súilleabháin, Mícheál	1950-
Eaton, Maura	1960-	Parke, Dorothy	1904-1990
Edmondson, Philip	1952-	Parker, Brent	1933-
Farhat, Hormoz	1930-	Potter, A. J.	1918-1980
• Farrell, Eibhlis	1953-	Purser, John	1942-
Ferguson, Howard	1908-	Seaver, Michael	1965-
Fleischmann, Aloys	1910-1992	Shiels, Andrew	1957-
• Flood, Philip	1964-	Stanford, Sir Charles V.	1852-1924
Friel, Redmond	1907-1979	• Sweeney, Eric	1948-
• Gardner, Stephen	1958-	Thomas, Adrian	1947-
Geary, Bernard	1934-	Trimble, Joan	1915-
Gibson, John	1951-	• Victory, Gerard	1921-
Gribben, Deirdre	1967-	Volans, Kevin	1949-
Grocock, Joseph	1917-	• Wilson, Ian	1964-
Guilfoyle, Ronan	1958-	• Wilson, James	1922-
Gunn, Douglas	1935-	Zuk, Patrick	1968-
• Hammond, Philip	1951-		
Harty, Sir Hamilton	1879-1941		
• Hayes, Paul	1951-		
Hellawell, Piers	1956-		

\* Composers born or resident in Ireland  
 • Information sheet enclosed



-----  
 Please notify me when updates to this publication are available

Name: .....

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Address: .....

# Irish Composers

## ORDER FORM

Please supply the following scores:

Composer	Title	Score only	Score and Parts	Qty

**Do not send money with this form.** We will include a bill when we send your scores, adding the costs of postage and packing. If ordering from outside the EC, please indicate whether you would like items sent by surface or airmail.

Surface

Airmail

Name:

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Address:

The Contemporary Music Centre, 95 Lower Baggot Street, Dublin 2, Ireland.  
Tel: +353-1-661 2105 Fax: +353-1-676 2639

*the*  
**contemporary**  
music centre  
*Ireland*



# Gerald Barry

(b. 1952)

‘Gerald Barry is always sober, but might just as well always be drunk. Being Irish that would be his birthright, so to speak. His piece ‘\_\_\_\_\_’ is, on the contrary, not rectilinear but ~~~~~.’

(Mauricio Kagel)

Gerald Barry was born in Co. Clare, Ireland. He studied in Dublin, Amsterdam, Cologne and Vienna, where his principal composition teachers were Karlheinz Stockhausen and Mauricio Kagel. He lectured at the National University of Ireland, University College Cork, from 1982 to 1986. His works have been performed throughout Europe and in North America and Canada.

Major commissions include *The Intelligence Park* (1982-89), commissioned by the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London; *The Triumph of Beauty and Deceit* (1991-92) commissioned by Channel Four TV, London; *Chevaux de Frise* (1988), commissioned by the BBC for the Henry Wood Promenade Concerts, and *Hard D* (1992), also commissioned by the BBC for performance by Orkest de Volharding, Amsterdam. Awards include the National University of Ireland Travelling Studentship; Netherlands, German and Austrian Government Scholarships; and the Marten Toonder and Macaulay Fellowships administered by the Arts Council of Ireland. Gerald Barry is a member of Aosdána, Ireland's state-sponsored academy of creative artists.

## Selected works

### ORCHESTRA

#### *Diner* (1980)

2222 4231 glock perc pf str  
OUP 6'

Premiere: 5 August 1988, Whitla Hall, Belfast. Ulster Orchestra, conductor John Lubbock

#### *Of Queens' Gardens* (1986)

1111 1110 mar+glock pf str [vn va db]  
OUP 10'

Commissioned by the New Irish Chamber Orchestra with funds provided by the Arts Council of Ireland  
Premiere: 29 September 1986, Wesley College, Dublin  
New Irish Chamber Orchestra, conductor Geoffrey Spratt  
Recordings: BBC London; RTE Dublin

#### *Chevaux-de-frise* (1988)

2222 4231 glock pf str  
OUP 19'

Commissioned by the BBC for the 94th season of Henry Wood Promenade Concerts  
Premiere: 15 August 1988, BBC Henry Wood Promenade Concerts, Royal Albert Hall, London. Ulster Orchestra, conductor Robert Houlihan  
Recordings: BBC London, RTE Dublin

#### *Flamboys* (1991)

2223 4231 mar pf str  
OUP 6'

Commissioned by the Trinity College Dublin Quatercentenary Music Sub-committee with funds provided by the Arts Council of Ireland  
Premiere: 14 May 1992, Point Theatre, Dublin National Symphony Orchestra of Ireland, RTE Concert Orchestra, conductor Owain Arwel Hughes  
Recording: RTE Dublin

See also versions for chamber orchestra of *Sur les Pointes* (keyboard) and *Hard D* (chamber ensemble)

### CHAMBER

#### ‘\_\_\_\_\_’ (1979)

Two versions  
1: cl, 2cl+2 bcl, hpd+pf, 2 va, 2 vc  
2: 2 cl+bcl, mar, pf, va, vc  
OUP 19 355337 6 10'

Premiere: 24 February 1980, Institute of Contemporary Arts, London Lontano

Continued

**Bob (1989)**

cl cl+bcl, vn, vc mar, pf  
 OUP 13  
 Commissioned by London New Music with funds provided  
 by the Arts Council of Ireland  
 Premiere 21 March 1989, Purcell Room, London London  
 New Music, director Michael Blake  
 Recording Westdeutscher Rundfunk Koin

**Handel's Favourite Song (1989)**

solo cl fl tpt trbn pf gui db  
 OUP 19 355334 1 6  
 Premiere 27 January 1985, Hugh Lane Gallery, Dublin  
 Students of Trinity College Dublin, conductor Michael  
 Taylor

**New Work (1992)**

tpt cl 2 perc pf db  
 OUP 10'  
 Commissioned by Array Music, Toronto  
 Premiere 2 February 1993, Toronto  
 Recording Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

**Hard D (1992)**

Chamber ensemble or orchestra  
 fl+picc, hn, 3 sax, 3 tpt, 3 trb, db, pf  
 OUP 15'  
 Commissioned by the BBC for performance by Orkest de  
 Volharding  
 Premiere 26 January 1993, Amsterdam Orkest de  
 Volharding  
 Recording BBC London

**Piano Quartet (1992)**

vn va vc pf  
 OUP 11'  
 Commissioned by the Institute of Contemporary Arts,  
 London  
 Premiere 6 December 1992, Institute of Contemporary  
 Arts, London Capncorn

**Low (1991)**

Clannet, piano  
 OUP 6'  
 Commissioned by John Finucane with funds provided by  
 the Arts Council of Ireland  
 Premiere 21 March 1991, St John s Smith Square, London  
 John Finucane (cl), Philip Martin (pf)  
 Recording RTE Dublin

**Au Milieu (1981)**

Piano  
 OUP 19 372231 3 10'  
 Premiere March 1981, Institute of Contemporary Arts,  
 London Herbert Henck (pf)  
 Recording BBC London

**Sur les Pointes (1981)**

Versions for piano, harpsichord, organ and chamber  
 orchestra  
 OUP 13'  
 Premiere 29 March 1981, Institute of Contemporary Arts,  
 London Herbert Henck (pf)  
 Recordings BBC London, Channel Four TV London

**Swinging tripes and trillibubkins (1986)**

Piano  
 OUP New Music '87 2'  
 Recording BBC London

**Triorchic Blues (1990)**

Piano  
 OUP 5  
 Commissioned by the 1991 GPA Dublin International  
 Piano Competition with funds provided by the Irish Music  
 Rights Organisation  
 Premiere 20 April 1991, GPA Dublin International Piano  
 Competition, National Concert Hall, Dublin Pavel  
 Nersessian (pf)  
 Recordings RTE Dublin, BBC London

**Ø (1979)**

Two pianos  
 OUP 19 372233 X 7'  
 Commissioned by Dublin Festival of Twentieth-century  
 Music  
 Premiere 9 January 1981, Dublin Howard Shelley, Hilary  
 Macnamara (pf)

**Five Chorales (1984)**

From *The Intelligence Park*  
 Two pianos  
 OUP 19 372232 1 9'  
 Premiere 1988, Almeida Theatre, London Andrew Ball,  
 Julian Jacobson (pf)

## VOCAL AND CHORAL

**The Intelligence Park (1982-89)**

Opera in three acts  
 S A Ct T Bar B soli, 1211 1210 pf str tape  
 Text Vincent Deane  
 OUP 125'  
 Premiere 6 July 1990, Almeida Festival, London Opera  
 Factory and Almeida Ensemble, conductor Robert  
 Houlihan, director David Fielding  
 Recording BBC London

**The Triumph of Beauty and Deceit (1991-92)**

Opera in two acts  
 2 Ct T Bar B soli, 1211 1210 pf str  
 Text Meredith Oakes  
 OUP 50'  
 Commissioned by Channel Four TV, London

**Things that gain by being painted (1977)**

Singer, speaker, vc, pf  
 OUP 20'  
 Premiere 24 February 1980, Institute of Contemporary  
 Arts, London Beth Griffith, Lontano

**Carol (1986)**

High and low voice(s), org/pf/hpd  
 OUP 19 343110 6 (X312) 3'

**Water Parted (1988)**

Counter-tenor, piano  
 Text Vincent Deane  
 OUP 8'  
 Premiere 25 May 1988, Brighton Festival, England  
 Nicholas Clapton (Ct), Kathron Sturrock (pf)  
 Recording BBC London





# Marian Ingoldsby

(b. 1965)

• *The important thing is not  
To imagine one ought  
Have something to say,  
A raison d'être, a plot for the play.  
The only true teaching  
Subsists in watching  
Things moving or just colour  
Without comment from the scholar.* •  
(Patrick Kavanagh)

**M**arian Ingoldsby was born in Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary. She studied composition with Gerald Barry at University College Cork and later with Paul Patterson in London. She has had works commissioned by, among others, Opera Theatre Company, Ireland (1991), the Presteigne Festival, Wales (1992) and, more recently, by the London-based piano trio, Cantamen. Her output includes choral music, songs, chamber and piano music and her first opera, *Hot Food with Strangers*, toured Ireland in 1991. Awards include an Arts Council of Ireland Travel Grant (1988) and the 1990 New Music for Sligo Composition Prize. She teaches in the music departments of Waterford Regional Technical College and University College Cork.

## Selected works

### ORCHESTRAL

#### *Adagio and Allegro for Strings* (1989)

MS £6.00 10'  
Premiere: 6 July 1989, Cork School of Music Cork  
Sinfonietta, conductor Brendan Townsend

### CHAMBER

#### *Written in Early Spring* (1987)

fl cl vn va vc  
MS £4.00 10'  
Premiere: April 1987, Aula Maxima, University College  
Cork. Staff and students of the University College Cork  
music department

#### *Trio* (1988)

Oboe, violin, piano  
MS £5.00 7'  
Premiere: November 1988, Hugh Lane Gallery, Dublin  
Members of the Dublin Sinfonietta

#### *Two Pieces for Clarinet and Piano* (1984)

MS 8'  
Premiere: Aula Maxima, University College, Cork  
Patrick O'Keefe (cl), Marian Ingoldsby (pf)

#### *Aubade* (1992)

Recorder, piano  
MS £3.00 5'  
Premiere: 6 March 1992, Aula Maxima, University College  
Cork Gudrun Schepokat (rec), Marian Ingoldsby (pf)

#### *Piano Music for Children* (1986)

Eight short teaching pieces  
MS

#### *Undulations* (1988)

Piano  
MS £4.00 4'  
Premiere: September 1989, New Music for Sligo  
Composers' Competition Gillian Smith (pf)

Continued

## VOCAL AND CHORAL

**Hot Food with Strangers (1991)**

Chamber opera

S Mez Ct T Bar soli, fl cl+sax vn vc pf perc

Text: Judy Kravis

MS £10.00 20'

Commissioned by Opera Theatre Company with funds provided by the Arts Council of Ireland

Premiere: 17 October 1991, Lombard Street Studios, Dublin. Anne O'Byrne (S), Colette McGahon (Mez), Kevin West (T), Jonathan Peter Kenny (CT), Gwion Thomas (Bar), Opera Theatre Company, OTC Ensemble, conductor John Finucane

Recording: RTE Dublin

**Triptych: Three Yeats Songs (1986)**

satb

Text: W. B. Yeats

MS £4.00 6'

Workshop performance by the BBC Singers, conductor John Poole, Seminar on Contemporary Choral Music, Cork International Choral Festival 1989

**Díomá (1988)**

satb

Text: Mairtín Ó Direán

MS 5'

Premiere: 1989, Cork International Choral Festival Cois Cladaigh, conductor Brendan O'Connor

**Primrose (1989)**

satb

Text: Patrick Kavanagh

MS £4.00 5'

Workshop performance by the BBC Singers, conductor John Poole, Seminar on Contemporary Choral Music, Cork International Choral Festival 1989

**Shed No Tear (1987)**

satb, pf

MS 4'

Premiere: 1988, Cork International Choral Festival Passage West Choral Group, conductor Martin Barrett

**Psalm 95 (1988)**

satb pf/org

MS £5.00 5'

Premiere: October 1988, National Concert Hall, Dublin. Dublin Boy Singers, conductor Frank Hughes

**To a Child (1986)**

Soprano, flute, piano

Text: Patrick Kavanagh

MS £4.00 5'

First broadcast: 11 May 1987, RTE Radio. Virginia Kerr (S), Deirdre Brady (fl), Roy Holmes (pf)

**Mary Pegge Songs (1990-91)**

Voice, piano

Text: Mary Pegge

MS £4.00 6'

First prize, New Music for Sligo Composers' Competition 1990

Premiere: September 1990, Hawkes Well Theatre, Sligo. Philip Martin (pf), Penelope Price-Jones (S)

**Song of the Half-cracked Echo (1992)**

Voice, piano

Text: Robert Nye

MS £4.00 7'

Commissioned by the Presteigne International Festival of Music and the Arts, 1992, as part of the 'Open Borders' scheme

Premiere: 1 September 1992, Presteigne International Festival of Music and the Arts, Alla Ablaberdyeva (voice), Adrian Williams (pf)

## **APPENDIX 7**

**Extract from the Music Publishers' Association's submission to the Arts Council of Great Britain, 1989, published with the permission of the Music Publishers' Association. Please refer to page 18. This table shows the expenditure by the publisher on a selected number of commissions and the income from those pieces earned by the publisher. It does not show the income earned by the composers.**

PUBLISHER	COMPOSER	TITLE	COMMISSION (FROM)	YEAR	DURATION	NO. OF PARTS	NO. OF PERFORMANCES	TOTAL EXPENDITURE	TOTAL INCOME (SALE, HIRE, PRS & MCPS)
BOOSEY & HAWKES	ROBIN HOLLOWAY	VIOLA CONCERTO	BBC PROM	1985	20'	42	3	£1,806	£766
BOOSEY & HAWKES	PETER MAXWELL DAVIES	AN ORKNEY WEDDING, WITH SUNRISE	BOSTON POPS ORCHESTRA	1985	11'	50	?	£6,520	£2,112
BOOSEY & HAWKES	PETER MAXWELL DAVIES	SYMPHONY NO. 3	BBC (FOR EUROPEAN MUSIC YEAR)	1984	50'	54	6	£25,462	£2,437
NOVELLO	BENNETT & MUSGRAVE	MOVING INTO AQUARIUS	ARTS COUNCIL RPS	1984	14'	30	3	£1,017	£431
NOVELLO	JOSEPHS	CIRCADIAN RHYTHMS	ARTS COUNCIL	1985	27'	37	1	£1,173	£231
NOVELLO	MANDVELL	DOUBLE CONCERTO	CARDIFF FESTIVAL	1985	22'	12	1	£474	£146
O.U.P.	MICHAEL BERKELEY	GREGORIAN VARIATIONS	PHILHARMONIA ORCHESTRA (DU MAURIER)	1982	17'	35	2	£1,718	£987
O.U.P.	GORDON CROSSE	ARRAY	BBC	1986	30'	14	2	£1,916	£659

PUBLISHER	COMPOSER	TITLE	COMMISSION (FROM)	YEAR	DURATION	NO. OF PARTS	NO. OF PERFORMANCES	TOTAL EXPENDITURE	TOTAL INCOME (SALE, HIRE, PRS & MCPS)
O.U.P.	WILLIAM MATHIAS	ORGAN CONCERTO	BBC	1984	28'	32	13	£3,961	£2,613 (More PRS overseas income to come)
PETERS	BRIAN FERNEYHOUGH	LA TERRE EST UN HOMME	BBC	1979	15'	101	10	£8,970	£885
U.M.P.	S. BAINBRIDGE	FANTASIA	BBC	1984	18'	25	3	£2,358	£866
U.M.P.	S. MONTAGUE	FROM THE WHITE EDGE OF PHYRIGIA	SADLERS WELLS BALLET	1984	29'	28	3	£6,106	£2,779
UNIVERSAL EDITION	PATTERSON	CONCERTO FOR ORCHESTRA	FEENEY TRUST FOR CBSO	1981/2	20'	33	26 + EMI RECORDING	£1,941	£2,500
UNIVERSAL EDITION	MULDOWNEY	PIANO CONCERTO	BBC PROM	1983	23'	29 + SOLO	8 + EMI RECORDING	£2,468	£2,000
UNIVERSAL EDITION	BEDFORD	SYMPHONY NO. 1	RLPO ARTS COUNCIL	1984	16'	32	7	£1,506	£1,100
UNIVERSAL EDITION	BIRTWISTLE	EARTH DANCES	BBC	1985	38'	67	7 + BBC TSCRIP	£12,015	£3,315