

# IFLA Bibliography Section Standing Committee

## Minutes from the meetings during IFLA WLIC in Columbus, Ohio

### 1. Standing Committee meeting I

(Saturday, 13<sup>th</sup> of August, 12.30-15.00, Room C212)

Present: Anders Cato, Anke Meyer-Heß, Jay Weitz, Marja-Liisa Seppälä, Mathilde Koskas, Rebecca Lubas, Miyuki Tsuda, Miriam Nauri, Grazyna Federowicz, Pat Riva

Regrets: Sinikka Luukkanen

Missing: Natalya Lelikova, Alexandra Teplitskaya, Jihye Song

Observers: Maxine Jones, Julianne Beall, Henriette Fog, Hanne Hørl Hansen, Jenny Wright, Joyce Jelks, Irina Kavčič, Vincent Boulet

#### 1.1. Welcome and introductions (Miriam Nauri, all)

Miriam greeted everyone and the meeting started by everyone introducing themselves.

#### 1.2. Adoption of the agenda (Miriam Nauri)

The agenda was adopted after an addition by Mathilde Koskas concerning the updating of GARR. That will be the last item of the agenda.

Added information to 2.3 from 1.9.3 concerning "What makes a professional unit?"

#### 1.3. Section financial report (Anders Cato)

The treasurer reported that with the new order within IFLA there is not so much financial report to give. We have 100 euros administrative funds to use per year. The administrative funds this year will be used to pay for the get-together of the IFLA Bibliographic Sections. There have been no project funds requested from our section this year.

#### 1.4. Action plan follow up (everyone)

See Annex 1 for the current action plan.

See also Annex 2 for the section's latest annual report

#### 1.4.1. National Bibliographic Register (Mathilde Koskas, Pat Riva)

Mathilde and Pat reported on the work with the register.

They have been working on a couple of different fronts, one more successful than the other. Some entries in the register are more up to date than others, but several countries still need to control their entries.

All 44 entries have been turned into tables, plus with a small explanation sheet. The work is not totally finished, but on its way.

A question on who has submitted and at what date should be registered, but that does not exist for the early entries.

Mathilde then demonstrated the tables. Sometimes they are difficult, because some countries are more specific than others. Not all information here fits in table format, but information as to what metadata formats, cataloguing standards etc. are used could fit fine.

Questions have arisen on how we want it published on the web and on how to keep it updated. A certain amount of data cleansing is also needed before publishing.

Mathilde and Pat asked if this resource will be of help. Do we need it? Do we want it? The reply from the meeting was: Yes, definitely. But as it is now it is hard to publish, because we are not sure that all information is correct. But no matter what it is at least much better than it was before.

We now need a nice disclaimer statement that we can all agree upon.

We need a simple fill-in-form with boxes, that can engage people to answer in an easy and consistent way, and we need deadlines to know when to work with it.

Maybe it's also a project that could qualify for project funding. Miriam agreed to look further into that.

#### 1.4.2. Section recruitment (all)

Elections will take place next year and nominations are due by November. Miriam encouraged everyone to talk to colleagues and others to get interested people to join our section and get nominated. Anke and Natalya can't be re-elected since they have already served their two terms. Four people are eligible for re-nomination. Those four were encouraged to see to it to be re-elected (except the one person who never comes to meetings). We should also try to get representations from the parts of the world that aren't in the section.

We have a new corresponding member from Cameroun, and we can actually appoint up to five.

Mathilde stressed that we should reach out to National Bibliographic Agencies as well. It does not have to be national libraries.

Rebecca agreed but pointed out that it might sometimes be very difficult. We have tried before.

#### 1.4.3. WLIC 2016 Open Program (Thursday 18. August 10:45-12:45, Room: Hall E) (Rebecca Lubas, arranging team)

Rebecca first reported on the good news: We did receive some great proposals for presentations this year. However, regretfully they were few, only five. We accepted four of them. However after that some problems emerged: One of the speakers from Iran was not granted VISA for the US. In the end we managed to solve it by her sending us a video of her presentation that will be shown at the open program.

Another speaker from India will not be able to come either, so in the end we only have

two live presentations.

Everyone was encouraged to read the papers before Thursday and prepare questions.

For next year everyone was asked to consider the possibility of making a joint program with another section. Could that bring greater success?

#### 1.4.4. "Best Practice for National Bibliographic Agencies in the Digital Age"

Report from the Editorial Group and further steps  
(Rebecca Lubas and the editorial working group)

Rebecca is the main editor of the best practice site.

Rebecca asked if a collaborative document could be of use, something like Dropbox or Google docs?

Pat however believed it to be easier if we have the chapters as word documents that you can print and read wherever you feel like it. Then the work gets done and you are not forced to be logged onto Google docs or Dropbox.

A question that needed discussion was whether this should be considered an IFLA Standard or not. The meeting however agreed on the fact that times change so fast nowadays, that it would be a bit awkward to call this a standard? We rather prefer to call it a document of shared experiences.

Mathilde stated that in its current form it is very far from a standard and a lot of work would be needed to make it become that. She is therefore in favour of keeping it as a document sharing experiences. It is important to keep it simple.

Miriam concluded that standardising national bibliographic work is very difficult. Legislation is different in different countries. Maybe we need to change the title of the document from Best practises to something better describing what it actually is, something like "Lessons learned...".

Miriam asked if set deadlines might produce more work being done? The meeting agreed.

Mathilde expressed a proposal on having the product both as a website and as a downloadable document.

IFLA now provides us with Basecamp for help in our work. Rebecca however thinks that Google docs is more user-friendly, but it's not reliable for long term storage. However that is not our ambition either.

The question of a review of proposed updates to Chapter 3 was deferred to the second meeting when the author of it could attend.

#### Members of the editorial Work Group 2017

Rebecca is willing to continue as main editor, but Anders will assist her whenever needed.

All other editors continue as well.

Grazyna is willing to step in and maybe also Myuko.

Someone should be willing to help Rebecca to prepare the documents for publication and we will also need a team for applying for project funds.

#### 1.4.5. Communication (Rebecca Lubas, all)

Strengthen communication through blog postings, news, info on events etc.

All members are invited to write blog postings.

Rebecca went through the state of the issue.

We talked about this issue also last year. The proposals always sound like a good idea, but it is hard to find the time and so the blog becomes out of date. We have a newsletter that is full of content. Maybe we should highlight matters arising from the newsletter, with links to the full content in the newsletter?

A question came up as to whether Facebook is an option? Rebecca concluded that we don't need to make anything new there; we can just recycle what we already have. But if you have a Social Media page, it gets very bad if you don't keep it updated. We could give it a try and close it again if it does not work. The issue as to whether it should be a closed or an open group was discussed.

#### 1.5. Action plan 2016-2017 (all)

Initial discussion of new actions to be included in the next action plan, including the theme of next year's open session.

Miriam went through the most important issues of the coming action plan.

- The Professional Committee really wants us to focus on projects.
- The Best practices document is one action, and maybe the name change of that document.

Mathilde proposed that we reserve a small part of the session for a presentation of the best practices.

- Next year's theme will be: Libraries, Solidarity, Society

We need a group for next year's open session. We hope our Polish members want to take part in that.

Several members proposed that we collaborate with other sections to get a better turnout. Possible collaborating sections are: Subject analysis, National Libraries, Indigenous matters, Library history.

#### Two suggestions:

"The National Bibliography as a mirror of the society/community"

"The National Bibliography as a tool for history"

- There will be a special issue of Cataloguing and Classification Quarterly on national bibliographies? Could our standing committee contribute in any way?  
Question: Would it be possible with several co-editors? Miriam will check with the editors.  
Pat pointed out that the hardest part of the work will be the reviewing of papers, so we have to be prepared to put quite a lot of effort in here.

#### 1.6. Midterm meeting? (Mathilde)

The possibility of having a midterm meeting was discussed and there was a general consensus that it would be a very good idea.

The good thing is that it is a full day, not only a few hours during an IFLA WLIC congress.

Mathilde made an offer that the Bibliothèque nationale de France could host it. For those who cannot participate in person, Skype conference calls could be arranged.

Also the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek offered to host a possible meeting. Athens could also be an option in connection with the recently decided upon IFLA Officers meeting in March. Miriam will look further into the issue given that so many of the participants were so positive.

#### 1.7. Name change (Miriam, all)

Do we want a name change for our section?

An initial discussion started based on the suggestions given by the Standing Committee members before the meeting. Proposed new names are:

*-National Bibliographic Services*

*-Bibliographic Data Services*

*-Bibliographic Services*

The second option was the one that most people seemed to prefer, but no decision was taken. The discussion will continue at the midterm meeting.

#### 1.8. Report from this morning's Professional Committee's Officers' Forum.

Miriam reported on two important announcements made this morning at the Professional Committee's Officers' forum:

##### 1.8.1. Meeting with all officers in March

All officers will gather in March in Athens to talk further on IFLA strategic directions and key initiatives.

##### 1.8.2. The agreement with De Gruyter will be discontinued

#### 1.9. Member in the GARR Working Group.

The Cataloguing Section voted to go ahead with the GARR Working Group. The question was posed as to whether this standard is relevant for our work?

It was concluded that GARR will have implications for our work, but not as direct as for the Cataloguing Section. Therefore the meeting proposed that we can propose participants for

the working group and we can comment on the document afterwards.

1.10. Meeting adjourned

The meeting was adjourned and will continue on the coming Tuesday.

## 2. Standing Committee meeting II

(Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> of August, 9:45-11:15, Room C225)

Present: Anders Cato, Anke Meyer-Heß, Jay Weitz, Marja-Liisa Seppälä, Mathilde Koskas, Rebecca Lubas, Miyuki Tsuda, Miriam Nauri, Grazyna Federowicz, Pat Riva

Regrets: Sinikka Luukkanen

Missing: Natalya Lelikova, Alexandra Teplitskaya, Jihye Song

Observers: René-Vincent du Grandlaunay, Irina Kavčič, Ylva Sommerland, Sonam Yudon, Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, Françoise Leresche, Patrice Landy, Sandy Roe, Jenny Wright, Vincent Boulet, Miriam Kahn, Imad Abuelgasim, Emelie Songolo

### 2.1. Welcome and introductions

Miriam greeted everyone and the meeting started by everyone introducing themselves.

### 2.2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

### 2.3. Reports

#### 2.3.1. From GARR

Vincent reported from the meeting on GARR. He felt that it was a good thing to have our section involved as well.

The question arose as to the time scope and expected work load of the project?

Vincent did not expect it to be that heavy, but reported that there would be a Skype meeting after conference to schedule everything.

Finally Grazyna and XXXX agreed to take on the work of being members of the Working Group.

#### 2.3.2. Best Practise document.

Eva-Maria Häusner and Ylva Sommerland from The National Library of Sweden have worked on the document. They were users of our best practices and had some thoughts about the text.

The use cases are a bit different from the ones from Denmark and the UK and they have therefore changed the document according to the experiences of the Swedish National Bibliography.

There are some topics that need more discussion:

- The digital environment today
- What is the purpose of the NB? The Metadata would be there anyway, even without the NB?
- Whose stories are we actually telling in the National Bibliography?

Anke commented that the national bibliography didn't start appearing until the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The idea comes from a European concept of those days. Why do we actually have a closed nation mirrored in the bibliography?

Miriam replied that it touches upon the question "Should we have National Libraries" – and "Should we have states", and so we are all of a sudden in a much greater question.

It was agreed that the Swedish text and the use case be added to the use case document, or possibly added as a link if the case is already stored somewhere else.

Questions posed in the document will be taken to the future work of the Best Practise group. Additional comments should be sent directly to Miriam and the committee.

Patrice asked about the status of this document. How will it be communicated? Will it be looked upon as a standard or as guidelines?

Pat concluded that standards normally tell you what you should do. This document tells you what is being done as a means of communicating best practice. The document never says that you must do a certain thing. Therefore it is not right for us to call it standard or guidelines. It should rather be something like: "Resource information for National Bibliographies".

Patrice agreed and he will be in touch later on how to best make the information available.

Miriam also expressed the opinion that we must change the name, to show that this is not the standard, this is something new and different.

Rebecca agreed to be the main editor for one more year.

Miriam and Rebecca concluded the discussion by saying that during the last half of this year we go through the chapters that each and every one is responsible for and we will then discuss further next year, above all at the midterm meeting. We will also try to have, and keep, deadlines. A common format would be nice, maybe developed by Rebecca. But if not, we already have a wiki on PBWorks.

#### 2.4. Information from Division Leadership Forum and Officers' Training Session (Miriam Nauri, Anders Cato)

Miriam reported from the Division Leadership Forum: It was supposed to be a group discussion,



but the meeting never got that far. The “short reports” from the sections regrettably took all the time. There was no time for discussion which was the main issue of the meeting. That of course led to members pointing out that the Division Leadership Forums did not serve their purpose. They must be organised in another way.

It was decided at the meeting to ask for an extra time slot for reports to get updated on each other’s works. Then the ordinary forum can be used for more strategic discussions.

The Officer’s Training Session was about “Speed dates” and Miriam and Rebecca went. The meeting divided the participants into groups and they then had to circulate within the groups and talk to different people each for a short period of time. Those discussions turned out to be very fruitful.

Rebecca discussed standards and got the feeling that people too much look upon our document as a standard which makes it too intimidating.

Miriam went to a group discussing surveys. A lot of initiatives and projects gathering data are going on. IFLA has also bought an app for surveys.

#### 2.5. IFLA Standards (Anders and Miriam)

From IFLA:s strategic directions: “developing and continuously updating IFLA Standards and Guidelines, and promoting their implementation by the library sector worldwide. “ As part of this process the Committee on Standards is currently undertaking an audit to assess [IFLA’s Standards](#) for currency and relevance and will undertake an in-depth analysis use data including downloads, sales data from IFLA HQ and any other identified sources.

It was concluded that we had already had this discussion earlier and the reply is that our best practice document should not be looked upon as a fixed standard, but as an ongoing state of the art document with advice on what best practice could be used. However the old published “National Bibliographies in the Digital Age” could be seen as a kind of standard.

#### 2.6. WLIC 2017 section program, continued discussion (all)

##### 2.6.1. Theme?

The following theme was agreed upon:

”Challenging society and naming identity. Bibliography in a multicultural world”

##### 2.6.2. Arranging team

Arranging theme will be: Grazyna, Anke and Rebecca, and Miriam will also take part party in reviewing the papers. Anke agreed to be the convenor of the group.

#### 2.7. Action plan 2016-2017 (all)

Conclusive discussion of actions to be included in the next action plan, including project funding and future needed funds.

2.7.1. We plan to have a midterm meeting.

A midterm meeting will also be a teambuilding activity in itself.

Different possible dates to have the midterm meeting were discussed. The end of the fiscal year is not the best time, but that means January for some, July for others, and April for others.

2.7.2. Best Practice Document: There should be responsible people for each chapter.

2.7.3. National Bibliographic Register: We will continue with the tables that had been prepared by Audrey. The data tables will be cleaned and calls for updates will be sent out. The IFLA Questionnaire can be converted into a survey. We need a pretty easy to answer survey. This will also create an interest among those replying. This can feed into the work on updating the best practices.

It was decided that we will formulate this as a project and ask for project funds.

2.7.4. Section recruitment should be a specific action. We need more nominations. We will try to reach out more to the continents with bad representation, particularly in Africa, South America and Oceania.

Mathilde informed the meeting that she has recently tried with Bhutan.

Anke is leaving the Standing Committee soon and we do hope for a new nomination from the German National Library, and we are also in need of someone from the British Library.

Chantal has talked to our corresponding member in Cameroun. She would like an Action Plan for Africa to be part of our action plan.

2.7.5. Mid-term meeting. It's a teambuilding activity in itself.

Miriam concluded this item by stating that she will draft a new action plan and send it out to everyone for comments.

2.8. Name change? (all)

Continued discussion and decision.

Pros and cons on different name proposals were discussed.

"Bibliographic Data Services": It is broader and doesn't limit anyone out. It has potential

One concern though: It might exclude people working with historic bibliographies, and also subject bibliographies.

Another proposal was: "Bibliography Data Services".

Yet another one could be "Bibliographic/Bibliography Data" or "... data and services"

Rebecca and Miriam concluded that we will need a discussion with the members on this and cannot reach a conclusion today.

2.9. Major developments (all)

Have you been involved in major developments, which you would like to share with the rest of us?

The meeting decided to keep this for the blog, due to lack of time.

2.10. CCQ.

Opportunity to contribute on a special issue on National Bibliographies. Pat has shared her experiences of earlier work. Time frame: Thematic issues twice a year. Process can be nine months all together.

Miriam: This is not in our action plan, but our committee can be a resource here. This can also be written by somebody else. Anke and Mathilde showed interest in working on it. There can also be more than one editor.

2.11. Gift from Poland

The Polish delegates handed out a nice gift to everyone present.

2.12. End of meeting

Miriam declared the meeting finished and thanked everyone for attending.

## Bibliography Section Action Plan 2014-2015

The activities of the section are very much focused on national bibliography advocacy and in particular the impact of digital publishing. Thus, the action plan is very much in alignment with the IFLA key initiative: A programme advocating the role of libraries in providing digital access to content in their communities.

The nature of the section activities is a mix of documentation, guidelines, knowledge sharing and papers/presentations.

We believe that supporting the library community's transition into a networked environment with metadata is crucial. Furthermore that national bibliographic metadata should be openly accessible. This is reflected in the action plan and has a clear link to the IFLA key initiative 1 Digital Content Programme.

### Section recruitment

- Make the English version of the section information sheet up-to-date and see to it that the translations follow the updated document (Pat Riva et al.)
- Other ways of informing about the section than a printed information sheet – bookmark (from budget?) (*Anke Meyer-Heß & DNB to print*)
- Use the directory of the Africa Section for reaching out to potential new members.

### Guidelines “Best Practice for National Bibliographic Agencies in the Digital Age”

- New focus on the implications of e-legal deposit for national bibliographies (workflows, standards, licensing, scoping and access issues)
- Continued work for open access (Carsten Andersen, Anders Cato, Guidelines working group)
- Continue work with a new online version
  - Call people of existing text to provide updates
  - Take new reviews of the topic to draft
  - Clear the copyright for the reuse of the emerging text
  - Completion of some chapters of original concepts + principles
  - Enhance adoption of existing text with description of one new area (suggestions: lessons learnt, linked data, survey of usage, statistics, self-publishing, print on demand etc.)
    - List of new topics to be created on the Wiki (members to contribute ideas)
  - Continued work with the editorial plan and making sure that the work runs smoothly.
  - In connection with the editorial plan see to it that the work carried out is following the IFLA Standards manual, published in 2014
  -

Working group: Neil Wilson (convenor), Karin Kleiber, Anke Meyer-Heß, Vincent Boulet, Carsten Andersen, Pat Riva

Face to face meeting at DNB – possibly with voice conference in the afternoon to wider members of group.

Neil Wilson (convenor) and Anke Meyer-Heß will continue working on an editorial plan and present it during WLIC 2015.

The group will report to the section at the SC meeting during WLIC 2015.

*Main focus is on this action in the Action Plan during 2014-2015.*

### **National Bibliographies Register**

The register shall be open to all bibliographic agencies or institutions that perform the functions of a national bibliographic agency.

- Engage with the Africa Section to add more entries for African countries. Use the directory of African libraries to contact libraries
- Look into potential needs for general updates of template and consequently existing entries
- Continue to examine options for linking NBR and Best Practice site
- Examine search option for area?
- Spreadsheet on scoping etc.? (Pat Riva to supply example covering topics of interest)

NBR-group: Neil Wilson (convenor), Anke Meyer-Heß.

The group will report to the section at the SC meeting during WLIC 2015.

### **National Bibliographic Agencies' RDA policy decisions**

The ISBD Review Group is working on an ISBD/RDA application profile, right now a spreadsheet showing the JSC national libraries and their choices regarding ISDB/RDA. 2013-2015 have been the first years of RDA in practice in some countries. How have national bibliographic agencies and their national bibliographies reacted?

- Continue to monitor adoption and practice among national bibliographic agencies

### **WLIC 2015 Cape Town**

Organize an open programme entitled *National bibliographies transformed : matters relating to the legal deposit of electronic resources* (Miriam Nauri, convenor)

### **Communication**

Strengthen communication through blog postings, news, info on events etc. (All SC members)

Possible joint newsletter with other bibliographic sections. Contact the other sections (Neil Wilson)

## Bibliography Section Annual Report 2015

Prepared by Anders Cato, outgoing chair and Miriam Nauri, incoming chair

### Mission

The Bibliography Section furthers universal bibliographic control (UBC) by promoting standards and best practices in the production, content, arrangement, dissemination and preservation of bibliographic information related to the national output of each country. In the context of UBC, the Section is particularly concerned with the work of national bibliographic agencies in the digital era. It is also concerned with the promotion of the importance of national bibliographic data [the discipline of bibliography] to library professionals in all types of libraries, publishers, distributors, retailers and end-users. Promotion of open access to national bibliographies and business models in support of this are also important issues, bearing in mind the need to balance open access/extra services. While taking full account of technological capabilities, the Section will ensure that its solutions are not necessarily dependent on particular technologies. The Section closely associates its work and activities with that of other sections within the Library Services Division. Where appropriate, it seeks ways to cooperate with divisions and sections beyond Division III.

### Membership and officers

Approximately eighty associations, institutions, and personal affiliates are currently members of the Section. At the moment, the SC counts 13 full members and 2 corresponding members. The following nations are represented: United States, France, Russian Federation, Japan, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Canada, Republic of Korea and Japan. Anders Cato, Danish Agency for Culture, served as chair up until the SC meeting in Cape Town in August, where he was replaced by Miriam Nauri, National Library of Sweden. Anke Meyer Heß served as secretary/treasurer up until the SC meeting and was then replaced by Anders Cato. Neil Wilsn, British Library served as information coordinator/web editor up until the SC meeting in August, when he was replaced on that post by Rebecca Lubas, Claremont University Consortium.

### Activities in 2015

- Cape Town SC meetings

Minutes from the meetings are available at:

[http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/bibliography/bibliography\\_section\\_standing\\_committee\\_meetings\\_cape\\_town](http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/bibliography/bibliography_section_standing_committee_meetings_cape_town)

- Cape Town open session

The open session was entitled “ National Bibliographies Transformed: Matters Relating to the Legal Deposit of Electronic Resources ” and was a session which received a great deal of interest and we counted to around 150 number of visitors.

Papers are available on the IFLA website: <http://library.ifla.org/view/conferences/2015/2015-08-17/560.html>

## **National Bibliographies in the Digital Age: Guidance and New Directions**

It has been decided to replace the title “National Bibliography in the Digital Age” with “Best Practice for National Bibliographic Agencies in the Digital Age”, a website of which an important part will be use cases and examples of best practice. An editorial group for the new website has been working on it since 2014. The members of the editorial group are the following: Pat Riva, Nicola Potgieter, Miriam Nauri, Mathilde Koskas and Anke Meyer-Heß. The website can be viewed at <http://www.ifla.org/node/7858>

## **National Bibliographic Register**

The number of entries in the register remains at 44, despite a series of e-mails to national libraries and other agencies. Members who have not yet supplied details for their national bibliographic agencies have been encouraged to do so. An online form will be set up to make it possible to contribute ones data directly to the information coordinators.

## **IFLA Namespaces Technical Group**

The section has two representatives to the IFLA Namespaces Technical Group during 2013-2014.

## **IFLA WLIC 2016**

For IFLA WLIC 2016 in Columbus, Ohio the Bibliography Section will organize an open program entitled "Opening the National Bibliography: Transforming Access to Data and Building Connections".