Present:

Mélanie Roche (Chair, France)
Merideth Fletcher (Secretary, Canada)
Ted Westervelt (Information Coordinator, United States)
Ángela Quiroz (Chile)
Elise Conradi (Norway)
Jennifer Wright (Scotland)
Joan Wang (China)
Karina Esman (Russia)
Mariia-Lisa (Finland)
Lucia Sardo (Italy)
Marja-Lisa Seppälä (Finland)
Mathilde Koskas (France)
Miki Yamaguchi (Japan)
Ruzilah Ehsan (Malaysia)
Sophia Zapounidou (Greece)
Trine Adolfsen (Norway)

Regrets:

Renate Behrens (Germany)
Fabyola Lima Madeira (Brazil)

1. Welcome and introductions

As the group was recently reconstituted with incoming members, the Chair suggested a round of introductions to get acquainted with each other and learn where everyone was located.

2. Approval of the agenda

The agenda was initially approved without any changes, though mid-way through the meeting the Chair was asked to provide an update on International Cataloguing Principles (added as agenda item 6.3).

3. Approval of minutes of Rotterdam meeting (August 2023)

The minutes of the CAT business meeting during the WLIC conference were approved with suggested amendments and remarks.

4. Chair’s report
   4.1. Report from Division H Meeting

The Chair attended the Division H meeting on September 19, and reported to CAT on topics that had been discussed that related specifically to the work of our section.
The Chair explained that Division H reports to the Professional Council (PC) and that CAT as a professional unit reports to Division H, along with Bibliography, Subject Analysis and Access (SAA) and Information Technology Sections (IT) Sections, and a few special interest groups. She said that we’re fortunate that the sections under Division H have similar interests and concerns, which is not always the case. The Chair of Division H reports to the PC, which sets the strategic direction of the work of our section. The Division H chair reviews the action plans for the division and the PC endorses them.

The priorities for the PC until 2025 are:
- Working on their code of ethics and conduct. There is already a code for the Governing Board, but the PC wants their own as well, for themselves and all volunteers doing IFLA work. An announcement will come out about this soon.
- Working on some procedures such as data management
- Launching what they call unit reviews. It is likely that the units will launch their own review to look at the scope and relevance of their sections, to identify if the sections need any support, and to consider any groupings that are needed with the other units or Special Interest Groups. This review will likely happen every five years.

4.2. Membership status

The Chair provided the following information about membership status.

Professional units are composed of elected members. The sections are also allowed to have co-opted members but only if they haven't been able to fill all twenty-four spaces (which CAT has). The only other case where our section could co-opt would be if we wanted to have more regional diversity.

IFLA also has what they call mentors. These are not regular elected members, and they are not able to vote. Mentors are experts who can offer advice and expertise, for instance, past members that the sections don’t want to lose. Each section can have up to three mentors.

Regarding liaisons, in the past every unit was allowed a certain number of liaisons to other groups. The sections liked liaisons and made extensive use of them but the Chair believes this is no longer allowed by IFLA. This poses certain problems, such as what is the status of existing external liaisons with other bodies? For example, Kate James (OCLC), was planned to be the American Library Association’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access liaison replacing Jay Weiss. K. James is currently attending our meetings as an observer only while the PC evaluates this question. We should know more at a later point about questions such as whether liaisons can vote or get involved in projects and working groups or projects.

4.3. Action Plan 2023-2025

The Chair noted that for the PC to follow the work of the sections, each section project should appear as an item of its action plan. These action plans are then sent to the relevant division which will duly report to the PC. In this way, the governance bodies keep track of work that is being done in sections and make sure that everything on track.

The Chair noted that Athena Salaba, our Section H chair, had suggested that the sections should focus on three prominent projects (this is advice, not a rule). Athena had also suggested that Sections should focus time, energy, and resources to their most prominent projects.

The action plan needs to be formalized and sent to Division H by October 31.
5. **New or ongoing projects**

5.1. **Data accessibility**

The Chair noted that accessibility was a topic that had emerged during the WLIC Rotterdam business meeting of the CoS. At this meeting Chris Oliver had gathered everyone interested in standards on metadata and accessibility. The discussion points included:

- How to describe metadata for accessibility
- Accessible resources

The Chair clarified that this topic is not about access. Rather this relates to ensuring accessibility of resources to people with disabilities and visual impairments.

The Chair noted that there was new interest in this topic because of the 2025 European directive that will oblige publishers to make accessibility metadata available to the public.

The Chair noted that it may not be a standard that is needed, but rather rules and instructions on how to create metadata for these materials. She said that if we want to enter this data from a very practical point of view, UNIMARC already has room for this new data, but that MARC21 hadn’t yet had this evolution from her understanding. She said that people needed to have instructions on how to input the data, where it should be stored and what the purpose of the metadata would be.

The Chair said that this is an emerging topic with an urgent deadline. If we are to produce something by 2025 to help publishers and libraries, we had better get started now.

The interested sections will be creating a network related to this topic. Networks are a new approach to cooperating within IFLA that was recently advertised by IFLA. Networks are intended to facilitate communication among sections that wouldn’t normally talk with each other but have common topics to discuss together. Networks are to report directly to the Governing Board, not the PC, as networks are horizontal organizations. Their functioning is very informal.

The Chair noted that this topic is of prime interest to CAT, and that there are many in this committee who love to provide standards and would be more than happy to collaborate on this. The chair suggested that we make this activity an item of our action plan to demonstrate our interest in it. We have also been asked by Chris Oliver to be a sponsoring section for the network. The sponsorship of interested sections is required to demonstrate interest in the issue and ensure that work will be reviewed and followed up on. Bibliography, CAT and other horizontal sections have been asked for their sponsorship.

The chair said that she supported this motion but would leave this up for discussion and debate before agreeing on behalf of CAT. There was general agreement and support from the membership.

The Chair said that she would be representing CAT in future informal meetings. She said that she will consult CAT to ask for advice and to review and select options.

The Chair also said if there was someone who felt strongly that they had the expertise to take on this work, that was also possible. M. Fletcher mentioned her interest and experience with this topic (she manages Alternate format description at LAC, and Chairs the Metadata Working Group of the ARL-CARL Task Force on Marrakesh Treaty Implementation) and she suggested not that she would like to replace the Chair on this file but rather could work with her. M. Fletcher to discuss with the Chair after the meeting.
5.2. Renewal of UBC

The Chair gave the floor to M. Koskas, who hosted the Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC) satellite session (August 18-19, 2023) before the WLIC Rotterdam conference. The Chair noted that there were a lot of arising issues, and discussion of how we go forward with UBC.

M. Koskas noted that a meeting had taken place in late September 2023 attended by herself, Maud Henry, and Pat Riva, who had done the keynote and conclusions with M. Koskas at the UBC satellite session. They proposed that the metadata sections start a UBC working group. This would primarily be the responsibility of the Bibliography Section. Bibliography will have their business meeting later in October and M. Koskas will attend. She said that she would let us know after the meeting what was decided.

M. Koskas will suggest at the Bibliography Section meeting that a relatively small working group be established for the next 12 months, modelled on the reflection on the IFLA metadata standards that had been led by past CAT chair Vincent Boulet. On the WG there will be a rep from each metadata section, along with other experts on the topic. The goal before next summer (2024) will be to try and understand whether a new IFLA declaration or a new standard on UBC is required. Questions to be considered and clarified are: what UBC entails for IFLA’s inner workings, who this work would be submitted to, who would approve it, and what are the advantages of it being a standard?

The WG will start gathering the main points. M. Koskas suggested calling this a declaration for now. She asked whether a goal would be to prepare the work that could then take place over the next couple of years. If so, then an updated declaration on UBC could be prepared, soon, around 2025. M. Koskas suggested that the work should be started as soon as possible, for example in November 2023. She asked whether the CAT membership approved this approach, and whether there were any comments from the members.

M. Koskas said that UBC was a concept created by IFLA and UNESCO about 50 years ago. The idea was that each nation, through their national bibliographies, would catalogue the cultural and intellectual output of their country. Putting all the cataloguing outputs of these countries together, “universal bibliographic control” would be reached. The idea of the word “control” today can feel very “controlling”. But really it means in the sense of knowing what is available and being able to identify these resources. Also, all the user tasks weren’t defined as such when UBC was developed 50 years ago. In the past, UBC wasn’t just a concept – it was a programme in IFLA. (IFLA had programs in the past). Under this programme, UNIMARC and other practical tools to achieve the goal of UBC were developed.

M. Koskas was asked how UBC should be adapted from the bibliographic world of today to an entity-relationship world of tomorrow?

M. Koskas said that this was why we want to have work done on UBC. Based on discussions at the Satellite meeting, it was fairly certain that UBC will still be relevant in the new Library Reference Model (LRM) context. However, UBC will need to be updated.

The Chair told M. Koskas that when it is determined what resources are needed for this work, CAT is ready to support in any way we can. M. Koskas can report this to the Bibliography Section. The Chair also said that CAT will be eagerly waiting for M. Koskas’ report.

M. Koskas asked if anyone had any input for her, or anyone with particularly relevant expertise on this topic that might be interested in participating in this work. Lucia said that she might be interested in contacting M. Koskas later.
Following up on agenda item 5.2, J. Wang flagged her knowledge on Accessibility related topics. She was the co-chair of an ALA core session in 2020 on this topic. She indicated that she would post these slides in Basecamp.

5.3. **Website maintenance and update**

The Chair indicated that this agenda item was intended to relate to both our website and more broadly communication of CAT. She said that she and T. Westervelt (CAT’s Information Coordinator) met at WLIC Rotterdam in August. They reviewed CAT’s webpages and noted that some maintenance needs to be done. The Chair plans to produce a website update plan for CAT to approve.

She said that the website needs to be spruced up and significant updates made. For example, the current website still implies that CAT is responsible for IFLA LRM which is not accurate.

T. Westervelt noted that he had been given access to the website and Twitter, and he said that the membership page (the responsibility of IFLA, not himself) had now also been updated. Members were asked to contact Mélanie and T. Westervelt if they didn’t see themselves listed on the membership page (or incorrect information appeared), in order that it could be rectified.

A member also noted that the IFLA BCM Review Group site was also seriously out of date.

T. Westervelt noted that the current website was overly cluttered, and it needed to be determined what content would be highlighted. T. Westervelt and the Chair said that they will work together to determine what to remove or archive to make the site cleaner and clearer.

T. Westervelt spoke about the Twitter account. He said that CAT currently had a fairly robust site and that he wanted the group to consider two possible paths going forward. One approach to get engagement would be to frequently report on Twitter. However, his inclination that that we shouldn’t just post official announcements but also be more relaxed about the contact included. For example, including announcements such as new cataloguer hires, specific work that was underway in libraries, resources of interest that have been catalogued etc. By doing this he said that we would increase the visibility of the content, the content would rise in people’s feeds, increasing the priority of the contact in the algorithm. He asked the membership if it agreed with retweeting messages. He also asked the CAT members to contact him if they had something interesting about cataloguing or metadata in their work or working groups so he could post a tweet. He said that for working groups and networks, the more content we can put out the more it will increase engagement. Then our more crucial info will be more likely to get out to our audience.

The Chair also indicated that we are not limited to the English language. We can link to content in other languages and provide some basic English text when retweeting. This would be a way of demonstrating the linguistic diversity of CAT. T. Westervelt said that if members tell him what terminology in other languages should be used for cataloguing, he’ll look for non-English content too.

T. Westervelt said that he would appreciate whatever guidance we can provide so he can highlight cataloguing around the world. He also asked what other tools, in addition to Twitter should be used to communicate. He indicated that he wanted to collaborate with other sections too to get messages out on the channels that they prefer, which may be different from ours (e.g. blog posts, listservs, or LinkedIn etc.) He asked the membership to let him know their perspectives on how best to get content out to the audiences we want. He asked if the memberships were in contact with colleagues using other tools such as Instagram, Facebook and LinkedIn and said that he was happy to post on them too. If so, he asked them to contact him via email to suggest ideas.

A YouTube channel for special events was also suggested, which T. Westervelt agreed with. He plans to reach out to other information coordinators to discuss this further.
6. Reports from ongoing projects

6.1. MulDiCat

The Chair said that the membership might remember from the WLIC Rotterdam meeting that the MulDiCat group was in the final stages of resolving all the comments from the various sections and review groups that had responded to the final list of MulDiCat terms. The group met the morning of October 2, and they have almost completed the task. The group will meet again October 9 to complete the review, assuming everything goes to plan. Allowing for the editorial work that will then need to be done, the working group plans to have a final list ready for endorsement of CAT and CoS by the end of October or November.

The Chair noted that she had been getting a lot of questions about when translations of MulDiCat could be started. She said that once the list was endorsed by CoS, translations could be started by various language communities.

The approach for MulDiCat maintenance, review and coordination with other standards going forward is currently undecided.

Once the editorial work will be finished T. Westervelt will be informed to spread the news and send out a call for translations from all over the world.

The Chair was congratulated on the progress of this work.

6.2. Co-convenorship of genre/form Working Group

The Subject Analysis and Access Section (SAA) spoke to the CAT Chair about a new co-convener for the joint working group for genre/form. She noted that traditionally this working group was chaired by two members – one from SAA and one from CAT. CAT’s representative was previously Ricardo Santos, a past member and information coordinator of CAT until August 2023. Given his departure the Chair noted that a new co-convener was needed who would be proactive in the WG and report back to CAT.

The Chair believed that the first meeting of the WG was scheduled for October 6. She noted that anyone who volunteered wouldn’t be expected to attend the first meeting, but it would be good for them to volunteer by Friday. The Chair asked for a volunteer, and when no one stepped forward, she asked whether there was agreement that it was the responsibility of CAT and in our section’s interest to have a co-chairmanship of this group. Several members noted they agreed but did not volunteer for the role. The Chair said that she would allow people to take time and consider it and get back to her the next day (October 3, 2023) if there were interested. She noted that the WG had been in place for several years and already had a full action plan, so this wouldn’t need to be developed from scratch. She also indicated that interested candidates did not need to be native English speakers, and that this role would be an asset to include on a resume.

6.3. International Cataloguing Principles (ICP)

At this point S. Zapounidou suggested that an update on the ICP Editorial Group should be provided. She referenced an idea of the past Chair of CAT, Vincent Boulet, to create a small WG to study identifiers and discuss best practices for cataloguing, and then report on this work.

The Chair provided a quick update. She said that there would be a meeting of the ICP editorial sub-group later in October to work on the ICP introduction, and to adjust some of the consistency issues that had arisen. The editorial group will then report their results to the larger ICP Working Group at a meeting scheduled for November. They anticipated that they would have a finalized, edited first draft ready by the end of 2023 for content comments from CAT.
Regarding identifiers, the Chair did not recall this idea but asked the membership if there was interest in forming such a group, or if there were ideas about expected deliverables. S. Zapoundou suggested that CAT wait until the ICP is published or there was a nearly finalized draft, and at that point consider working on this next year. The Chair agreed with this approach and suggested that other projects be finalized before CAT takes on new work.

7. Planning for WLIC 2024

The section had a lengthy discussion about planning for WLIC 2024. A lot of questions had been previously raised about this location, given that the program would not be open to all subjects and some members or organizations might not plan to attend as a result.

During the Division H meeting it had been noted that no arrangements had been included in the conference agreement for hybrid or virtual attendance of the conference. Unless amendment were to be made to the original agreement, there would be no virtual option.

A variety of options were discussed, including whether there was interest and capacity to:
- build a program or presence at the WLIC conference;
- plan satellite meetings in other countries;
- hold metadata webinars;
- hold virtual business meetings immediately before or after WLIC; or
- schedule mid-term meetings in another host country.

There was clear consensus that the section should not hold an open session at WLIC. The Chair said that she would inform the Chair of section H of this decision. There was also consensus that the section should pursue holding a mid-term meeting with the other metadata sections. This gathering could take of the form of meetings and information sessions about news and developments on bibliographic standards (LRM, MulDiCat, others). Paris and Greece were both suggested as possible locations, with virtual participation possible for at least the business meeting. The Chair said that she would contact the other sections to discuss.

When discussing the possible host countries, it was also flagged that some countries would be more likely to permit people from countries requiring visas to enter than others.

One member noted that in 2016 and 2017 two mid-year meetings were held at BnF, and funding was found from IFLA for some members who couldn’t be funded by their employers. These meetings were focused on projects. It was suggested that it might be possible to ask for funding from PC, and that if there were to be a working group or project component this might help get funding. Several members noted their agreement with this idea.

8. Other business

This agenda item was not discussed.

9. Adjournment

The Chair thanked everyone for their insights and support during the meeting, which she said had been productive. She reminded the group that the preferred method of communication for CAT remained Basecamp.