MINUTES

SC1

1. Welcome
   Introduction round

2. Approval of the agenda
   approved

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Kuala Lumpur Meetings, 2018
   Approved

4. Financial report
   4.1 Administrative funds - nothing to report
   4.2 Project funds

5. Section Development since the last meeting
5.1 Working Groups
   5.1.1 Genre/form Working Group
   In Kuala Lumpur, the working group aimed to decide which projects to be continued and which new ones to start. They examined genre/form position, models, rules, relevant documents, and monitored genre/form in catalogues worldwide. The goal was to create a list of vocabularies worldwide and make this document available. Previously, they had surveyed national libraries. Another goal is to compile a list of resources worldwide.

Two sheets have been created: Authoritative vocabularies (either general or focused scope). Sheet for references (sources for lists). The working group will continue to work together on both sheets. So far, they have gathered 36 references and 25 vocabularies. The sheets will be published after IFLA and be updated continuously on the genre/form working group website. Ana will send report to Harriet.
Meeting: Monday 9:00-10:30 in Megaron Room 5
The working group is using Google documents as a platform because they started before Basecamp.

The working group had applied for funding last year but wasn’t approved. They were given feedback that they would need to have a more formalized agenda, for example in the form of a workshop.

5.1.2 Subject Access Working Group
Subject Access in a Digital World. The group has had email contact and a web meeting this spring, plus a workshop yesterday at the conference center and a follow-up right before this current Standing Committee-meeting. The group plans to publish a report with case studies and a literature study. They are looking at automated processes (Artificial Intelligence + Machine Learning) in Subject Access. They aim to publish a draft of a report before next year’s IFLA. They will be creating a template to use to describe relevant projects. The scope is to look at projects that use automated processes with knowledge organisation.

The Working Group uses Basecamp to share documents.

5.2 Report on other actions undertaken by the Section in 2018/2019 (memberships, liaison)

None reported.

5.3 Section Newsletter
Harriet reported that the Metadata News collaborative newsletter has worked quite nicely and added that she would like to have more news about Subject Analysis and Access. All members of section and other contributors are encouraged to contribute articles about subjects. Harriet also welcomes comments to the newsletter and would like help with the newsletter.

Headquarters would like all Standing Committee members to be more involved, and contributing to the newsletter is a great opportunity to accomplish this.

5.4 Section Blog
Harriet reported that the blog is not very active and that it takes a lot of effort to keep it active. Harriet updates occasionally, for example about registration to Satellite meetings.

The group discussed whether it was necessary to have both a newsletter and a blog. Harriet commented that one major difference between the blog and newsletter, is that we can publish profiles of all members on the blog. We are not able to do this on the website. The blog needs to be updated now that we have new members.
5.5 Corresponding members
The Standing Committee is full right now. Two people were elected in, two didn’t make it. John suggested to extend invitation to Lea Contursi to be a corresponding member.

5.6 Elections
Harriet re-elected as Information Officer
Elise re-elected as Secretary
Athena elected as Chair

6. Website reorganization

John announced that a preview of the newly designed IFLA website was shown at the at Officers’ meeting this morning. 80% of the website is finished. Overall impression: More graphic than current website. The organisation is familiar. The new web structure will be imposed on our section.

Harriet remarked that information officers given a lot of information last year regarding what to retain and what to get rid of from website, but no information this year.

Athena wondered what happened to the logos we worked on in 2018. John said that the idea was likely abandoned for the time being because there are a lot of other projects going on.

7. Discussion of IFLA Strategy 2019-2024

The new strategy was unveiled at officers’ meeting this morning. Work started two years ago in Athens.


Elise presented Strategic Directions and Key Initiatives as they were presented in the Hague and discussed how IFLA would like Standing Committee to activate strategic directions.

Discussion: What about assessment? How can we measure impact? How can we report this assessment to HQ? Currently not possible to measure visits to websites? Action plan never set in stone, can be modified? Surveys can be measured, who is implementing them, etc. Find out how organisations are using subject terms and rdfs.

9. Overview of the Athens Conference Programme
   9.1 Open Session (August 28, 08:30-10:30)
Andreas discussed the upcoming open session, which is a collaboration with Arts Libraries. Title: "Libraries, Archives, Museums in Dialog": Breaking down silos. How can professionals be supported by linking metadata across collections with use of new technologies and tools?

25 submissions from all over the world
7 papers presented (US, UK, Singapore, ++)
4 of the papers have been translated into Spanish
Good collaboration, review group from both sections
Suggestions: count heads, take time, ask presenters to sit in front and read guidelines

9.2 Metadata session (August 28, 13:45-15:45)
The Metadata session is usually well-attended and includes reports from working groups and other relevant activities. John remarked that it is a good way to let the metadata community know what we are doing.

9.3 Metadata social (August 28, 18:00)
Poikili Stoa 14 Agiou Filippou, Athens
1 drink for each, covered by sections.

10. Section dinner
   Tonight at 9pm at Cocktail 360
   Meet at entrance at 20.30 and we can go together.
11. Discussion/Evaluation of Thessaloniki Satellite Conference and Athens Conference

11.1 Satellite Conference

Athena remarked that there were three wonderful presentations followed by round-table discussions, with a lot of participation and plans for a white paper.

Chris was impressed by the risk-taking with a new format for satellite, which worked extremely well. She was also impressed by the level of discussion and liked the format with presentation first to enable context for the discussion. She reported that there was very positive feedback in discussions from break.

Andreas also remarked on the lively discussions at tables. He stated that we should profit from the notes we took from the discussions and continue work with these. He also noted that the event was extremely well organised from University staff.

Harriet was slightly less positive. She was on the organising committee and aware that there would be a white paper afterwards. She found it difficult to hear everyone at her table, so discussions were difficult, and this affects the notes. Melanie Roche will be working on bringing it all together. Otherwise, she felt the conference was ambitious and wonders how much work needs to be done afterwards.

Athena reported that she heard a lot of positive feedback in general. She heard from hosts that they liked format and that it was engaging, and they would like to do something similar. Good thing to keep in mind in the future, that people like to be engaged.

11.2 Open programme evaluation

There were 6 presenters, 25 submissions, 4 papers translated into Spanish, and engaged presenters about metadata in archives, libraries and museums. The session also dealt with subject access to their collections. There were 120 in attendance in the audience, despite early timeslot after Cultural Evening. Art Libraries got offer that papers could be published in Arts Library Journal. Lucille (chair of Arts Libraries) and Andreas considering writing an introduction to the papers in this issue, which includes a big review team.

Harriet remarked that 7 presentations is quite a lot, so it was good that only 6 came because that gave us time for good discussions.

George commented that there had been some confusion about how long the session was going to be, but that they were really interesting presentations.
Athena remarked that Andreas and Lucille did excellent work in selecting papers and keeping everyone on time.

11.3 Overall organization
Rehab stated that the venue was very nice and cafeterias everywhere, and good that there were water dispensers everywhere. The business meeting rooms were too small, both at Athens College (where there was no air condition) and at Megaron. Very crowded rooms. It was hard to distinguish between Standing Committee members and observers. Signage was good at convention center. It’s not so big that you have to run far between sessions.

Aida gave thanks to kind, pleasant and very helpful Greek colleagues, both in Athens College and here. She added that the venue provided an excellent opportunity for mingling and networking. Try to avoid overlapping sessions within fields of interest.

Chris stated that we should perhaps report on the number of observers, as there are always less at meeting 2. If IFLA had the previous year’s numbers, they might have a more realistic sense of the size of rooms.

Andreas found the location for the Cultural Evening to be exceptional -- both outside and inside. He especially liked that people were actually inside using the library while we were there.

Athena remarked that the Business Meeting Rooms 1-4 were not sound-proofed so it was extremely difficult to hear everything within own meeting. In the future, we need real rooms, not just temporary walls.

Rehab noted that transportation from conference to Cultural Evening was difficult since last bus left at 7pm. This did not leave a lot of time between last session and when the bus left. Suggestion: later buses, maybe until 7:30pm. Some exhibitions isolated, which meant that they didn’t get much visitors.

Athena also remarked that it was positive that exhibits were all around during the conference and that people walked through and saw them without having to go to a specific room. It was negative, however, that they were in the halls and in the way.

**Theme:** Inspire - connect - enable - engage
Athena remarked that the theme aligns with newly released IFLA strategy. She also noted that Knowledge Management had a lot of overlapping themes with ours in their satellite conference and wondered if we perhaps should collaborate with them.

Harriet stated that Knowledge Management is interested in working with us, especially if we look into something with Artificial Intelligence. She had spoken with Spencer (secretary
of KM) and he stated they are interested in collaborating with us. They are open for a joint session.

Rehab concurred that it is an interesting topic and noted that we had several papers in this year’s open session that dealt with Artificial Intelligence and in the satellite. She thinks we can get many good proposals. She is positive to collaborate because she noted that we see our field in different perspectives.

Caroline noted that this might be an opportunity to encourage the Automated processes Working Group -- papers that aren’t accepted for session could be included in report or as case studies to investigate.

Aida was involved in organisation of ISKO AI conference. She reported that they didn’t get enough papers there, and that it is difficult to get papers from Knowledge Organisation people on Artificial Intelligence. They primarily got from people outside our field that use Knowledge Organisation Systems. Part of the conference had been on Ethics, and it was very good. Biases in Artificial Intelligence were discussed, also from a computer science point of view. She warned that if we do a session on AI, we need to be careful that we don’t have a session that allows for marketing of products.

Athena stated that in a collaboration, we would have to be clear that it should be library perspective, including subject analysis and access.

Andreas: The Knowledge Management lightning talk [on the preservation of metadata on dance] at Division III was unique.

Harriet announced that she would be happy to serve as a contact person with Knowledge Management.

The following volunteered to be on the planning committee for next year’s open session: Harriet, Sally, George, Chris, Aida, Drahomira, Rehab

Athena concluded that if Knowledge Management is not interested, we will pursue open session on Knowledge Organisation and Artificial Intelligence regardless.

13. IFLA matters

Athena announced that at Officers’ training, it was stated that the new website was estimated to be released at end of year. There is a lot of hope that it will be more engaging. She is unsure what sections will have to do regarding new site.

Harriet noted that there had been very little information about the website throughout the year. She is not impressed with storytelling aspect from communications meeting, although it is possibly more useful for other sections. Headquarters also want us to have a social
media presence. All twitter users in section should follow our twitter handle and are encouraged to tag @IFLASubj / #IFLASubj when we tweet about events within our field.

Rehab stated that in her experience, these types of tweets are often retweeted.

Harriet noted that she is entering her second term as Section Member and we have a new web coming up. She suggested that someone is co-information officer.

Caroline volunteered to be co-information officer.

Athena suggested that we use Basecamp for agendas, minutes, etc.

Deanna White (observer) noted that Basecamp is closed to members of the group and that it would be good to see agenda on website.

Athena stated that we can add non-SC members to Basecamp, but it is a working space.

Ana stated that the Genre/form working group wanted to migrate projects to Basecamp and suggested that we should have a Section Basecamp with WG-basecamps underneath. This way, all members can see what is going on in WGs, including lists in work, etc.

Elise volunteered to set up a basecamp.

Aida suggested that the secretary should set up plan for who has access to what and how to organise the space.

Athena announced the following deadlines:
Action Plans: October 15
Annual report, end of October

14. Unfinished business or updates from the first meeting
Action plans (Elise reports on two Action plans from 2 WGs)

15. Other business
Aida brought up the following topic: Subject Analysis and Access and training/LIS. She stated, “we should be aware of what is going on in LIS. Decrease in training related to subject analysis and access. What will this do to our field/ which affects with this have? ISKO Brussels chapter conference on this topic in June 2019. Library topics and programs often being dropped. Loss of knowledge about KO. How to define core concepts so they are not just related to libraries?”

Athena noted that ISKO summer 2020 in Denmark likely to address this and that we could potentially collaborate with them. We could also possibly collaborate with CATS. ALIS-
conference in September in Knoxville where there will be presentations about KO-education in the US.

Drahomira noted that we should possibly contact other groups, for example Eblida.

Aida proposes a Working Group on the topic.

George agreed that this is a very interesting topic to pursue, possible topic for webinars and workshops with other organizations.

Caroline reported that she is a member of CAMMS/ALECTS, and that they have done a gap analysis where they looked at curricula of several LIS-institutions and at job-listings and skills needed.

The following volunteer to be on the newly formed Working Group on Education: Aida, Drahomira, Athena, George, Sandy Roe (observer)

Adjournment
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