



Attendance:

Members: Victoria Owen (Chair), Pat Riva (Secretary), Vincent Boulet, Sharon Dyas-Correia, Deanna White.

Expert Advisors: Renate Behrens.

Liaisons: Joseph Hafner (LIDATEC), Ulrike Junger (CDNL), Gordana Mazić (PUC), Rehab Ouf (ISBD), Mélanie Roche (BCM).

Apologies: Beth Kilmarx, Fatemeh Pazooki, Maria Micle, Ana Stevanovic, Peng Xiao, Chris Oliver, Megan Price (IFLA Professional Support Officer), Helen Mandl (IFLA Deputy Secretary General).

Observers: Christian Aliverti (Swiss National Library), Miriam Björkhem (National Library of Sweden), Peter Björkman (Region Västernorrland, Sweden), Ana Bohn (Berlin Central & Regional Library ZCB, Germany), Ana Knežević Cerovski (National and University Library Zagreb, Croatia), Susan Morris (Library of Congress, USA), Sandy Roe (Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, USA), Marja-Liisa Seppälä (National Library of Finland), Jay Weitz (OCLC, USA), Jenny Wright (BDS, UK), Maja Žumer (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia)

1. Welcome

Victoria Owen welcomed members, liaisons and observers. The meeting had a quorum of half the voting members, despite last minute issues preventing the attendance of two members, and the inability to connect one member remotely.

2. Approval of the agenda

The agenda as revised on July 25th, was approved.

3. Minutes of the meeting of 20 June 2022

The minutes were approved as circulated.

4. Matters arising from the minutes

a. Standards Related Meetings at WLIC 2022

Deanna and Ana compiled a list of all relevant meetings and sessions and made it available on Basecamp and as a news item on our website.

5. Report of the chair

Victoria was invited to attend the meetings of the GB and PC to report on our work. This speaks to the importance perceived for our work. Victoria will report back at our BM II.

6. Membership and procedures

a. Processes for co-opting advisors and experts for RGs

There is so far no process established for co-option to RGs. The consensus is that this could be useful for the same reasons as for other IFLA units: expand geographical representation or add expertise required for current projects. Creating a formal process offers these experts recognition for their contributions, in a way that inviting them to meetings on an ad hoc basis does not. The ISBD RG would like to proceed quickly to formalize the roles of some of its experts. As CoS is the only IFLA unit which has RGs, we are able to create the process, adapting from the process used for co-opting in other IFLA units.

ACTION: Propose a draft procedure to consider at BM II.

7. Action Plan 2021-2023 update

We have made progress in most of our action areas:

- Website updating and restructuring, document migration
- Promoting the role of standards within IFLA, enhancing communications
- Ongoing reviews of new and updated standards and guidelines
- Standards Manual update
- Metadata for accessible versions of works

8. CoS reviews

a. IFLA Guidelines for Accessible Libraries and Services for Everyone

The reviewing group is Beth, Sharon, Deanna, and Chris. Work has started. Deanna notes that this edition is considerably longer than the document it supersedes, and wonders whether this is warranted. This is the first time these guidelines are reviewed by CoS, as the previous edition was published prior to the creation of the Committee.

The process and expectations for CoS reviews was discussed, as in previous meetings. The ad hoc reviewers are generally not experts in the topic of the guidelines but may make comments about substance and organisation. The expectation is that documents are submitted in a final version that would be suitable for publication. Documents that still require copy-editing or formatting will not be forwarded to the PC as is. However, the consensus is that a CoS review is about the content of the proposed standard/guideline. CoS should not merely be doing copy-editing. All CoS members, regardless of their level of English, should volunteer for reviews since copy-editing is not the goal. It is understood that, as an international organisation, members of IFLA units preparing standards/guidelines are not all native speakers of English, and thus final copy-editing help may need to be integrated into the process.

Guidelines for CoS members in performing reviews is a recurring discussion and likely requires an internal procedure document. This is distinct from the role of the Standards Manual which is intended to guide the professional units submitting the standards/guidelines.

ACTION: Prepare a brief procedure document for CoS reviews that clarifies the expectations of reviewers and what the reviews should focus on.

b. Status of recently reviewed standards/guidelines

- Bibliography Section *Common Practices for National Bibliographies in the Digital Age*: Published in the IFLA Repository just before WLIC. Website updated. **Complete.**

- *IFLA Guidelines for Professional Library and Information Science (LIS) Education Programmes*: Published in the IFLA Repository just before WLIC. Website updated. **Complete.**
- *Guidelines for Legislative Libraries*: At PC for approval during WLIC.
- *Library Services to People in Prisons*: Returned to the Section with minor comments.
- *RISS Guidelines*: Returned to the Section with more substantive comments.

9. Communications update

a. Web editors report

Since the last meeting there have been routine updates done to the Standards in progress page for the two recently published guidelines. These were also coordinated with the IFLA webmaster to update the list of Current IFLA Standards. Membership lists of CoS and the RGs were cross-checked and updated.

Pat completed compiling and formatting all CoS minutes, action plans, and annual reports. These are now ready for Deanna to upload to the repository. Once this is done, it will be possible to do the next phase of the website reorganisation: deleting the old meetings page, promoting the new conferences page to the menu.

The planned updating and restructuring of the liaison information is still pending the appointment of new ISO and CEN liaisons.

The RGs are also at various stages of cleanup/migration to the new website. There might be some opportunities to coordinate some aspects of the group sites with the CoS site, and to share best practices. Each RG has its own web editor: Mélanie (BCM), Joseph (LIDATEC), Rehab (ISBD) although Ricardo Santos had previously had access, Branka (UNIMARC). Rehab has worked with Louis to retrieve ISBD documents lost in the transfer to the new website. Branka has made progress with preparing full documents for uploading to the repository. On its old website UNIMARC had hundreds of documents. Propose a meeting of the web editors of RGs with Deanna and Pat.

ACTION: Pat will propose meeting dates in the fall for the web editors.

b. Communications WG and Newsletter report

Joseph reported for Ana. The Newsletter editorial group consists of Ana, Rehab and Joseph. They have created a Basecamp project for themselves. They have defined a template or basic structure for each issue of the newsletter. They will want a letter from the Chair. They will next develop content for a first issue to appear in December 2022. Frequency 2x per year. As this is an online only newsletter, to apply for an ISSN need to have published an issue and have at least 5 articles published.

10. Standards Manual review WG report

Vincent reported that the group has continued to make progress on two fronts:

- Updating the content of the Manual with respect to the new IFLA governance structure. Generally, any professional unit may propose a standard/guideline. It needs to be clarified whether this includes the Regional Divisions.
- Adding clarification where needed in the rest of the text with the aim of making the procedures more easily understood.

The WG may try to meet informally in person in Dublin. Plan to have an updated text for comment by the end of 2022.

11. Review Groups reports

a. LIDATEC

Joseph gave the context for the *Guidelines for Maintaining and Documenting IFLA Vocabularies* that was made available on Basecamp. More detailed discussion is planned during the LIDATEC business meeting. The document raises important policy issues.

- What licensing is appropriate? It would be the same license for the whole site.
- There needs to be documentation on the namespace about each vocabulary, but without duplicating or varying from the information on the IFLA website, which should be linked to.
- Should vocabularies be created pre-release or pre-approval? If so, at what stage of the work. Is the namespace a working tool during the development of a vocabulary? Could this be misleading to the user community if there are many substantial changes?
- What is the best way to publish standards? Particularly technical standards that continuously evolve? Currently the official documents are issued in PDF and the namespace comes later. Some aspects of the text, such as examples, and extended explanation, do not fit into the namespace but are needed. Should this be entirely integrated and lead to a more linked-data compatible mode of publication? If so, this will require an infrastructure, funding and support. It needs to be sustainable in the IFLA context.
- ISBDM feels an urgency to resolve the support for online publication of standards at this point in their work.

For IFLA to support a broader infrastructure for online publication of standards, CoS will need to articulate the need, the level and length of commitment, whether the need is for software or also for human resources. Victoria feels we would need to explain that this is a long-term need and unlike other Advisory Committees. This can be situated in how other metadata communities, including ISSN and RDA, are publishing their technical standards. It is becoming a common concern. ISO TC46 is also beginning to experiment with “smart” standards respecting the FAIR principles.

b. PUC

Gordana reported that the regular annual PUC meeting was held recently. A main focus was on describing numismatic (coin) collections, a need that was brought by France. The LRM work-expression alignment is complete. Working with the ISBD for manifestations WG to examine the impact of their work, are creating a WG to prepare the required proposals. UNIMARC has been working with LIDATEC to finalise the UNIMARC/Authorities namespaces and working out a process for annual revisions.

c. BCM

Mélanie reported that the main focus remains the development of LRMoo. The entire BCM meeting during WLIC is devoted to discussion of the most recent LRMoo draft, now very close to complete. The plan is to bring any further substantive changes for discussion at the CIDOC CRM SIG meeting 13-16 September 2022 in Rome.

d. ISBD

Rehab reported that the 2021 release/update of the ISBD was published 24 May 2022. It is described in an article in the June *IFLA Metadata Newsletter*. This coincides with the 50th anniversary of the ISBD. Received requests from Spanish and Italian translation teams. Have updated the full ISBD examples and added more languages. This release requires updating the ISBD namespace. However, need a policy on how to handle updates to existing namespaces. The ISBDM WG estimates its work is 75% complete and is continuing its work during a closed meeting during WLIC. Still considering issues such as granularity and prescriptiveness, as well as examples. Would like to extend the WG with additional experts to complete this work.

12. Proposal for integration of IFLA Bibliographic Metadata Standards

CoS received a proposal from the Cataloguing Section, supported by three documents circulated with the agenda. Vincent situated the request to create a short-term task group to consider the overall standards strategy, considering new directions such as the role of identifiers, to report by WLIC 2023. The current model maintains each standard separately, however, the bibliographic metadata standards feed into each other and there should be a logical flow and integration. From conceptual models and principles, to cataloguing instructions, to metadata encoding. The namespace and MulDiCat play key roles in integration. Structurally, some standards are maintained by RGs reporting to CoS, while others, including MulDiCat, are under the Cataloguing Section.

Discussion of which IFLA unit(s) are appropriate to create this group, and where its report is directed. Victoria concurs that CoS, jointly with CATS, has the level of oversight necessary to create the group. Its report should be presented to the PC. The group must be constituted promptly to report in a year.

ACTION: Vincent to confirm with the RGs individually and the other metadata sections whether they agree to participate and report back at the CoS BM II.

ACTION: Victoria and Vincent prepare a terms of reference document for the working group.

13. Other business

No other business identified.

14. Next meeting

This year all IFLA units are expected to hold Annual Business Meeting II online, by end of August if possible. A doodle will be sent out with proposed dates.

15. Close

Membership 2021-2023	
Victoria Owen (chair)	1. Term
Pat Riva (secretary)	1. Term
Deanna White	1. Term
Beth Kilmarx	1. Term
Vincent Boulet	2. Term
Sharon Dyas-Correia	1. Term
Peng Xiao	1. Term
Maria Micle	1. Term
Ana Stevanovic	1. Term
Fatemeh Pazooki	2. Term
Ex-Officio Member 2021-2023	
TBA	IFLA Secretary General or Designate
Liaisons and Support Officer 2021-2023	
Megan Price	Professional Support Officer at IFLA HQ
Gordana Mazić	PUC liaison
Joseph Hafner	LIDATEC liaison
Mélanie Roche	BCM liaison
Rehab Ouf	ISBD liaison
Ulrike Junger	CDNL Representative
Expert Advisors 2021-2023	
Renate Behrens	1. Term
Chris Oliver	1. Term