IFLA

Division III - Library Services

Classification and Indexing Section

Standing Committee Meetings

81st IFLA General Conference and Council

Cape Town

Minutes of meetings

SC1 - Saturday, 15 August 2015, 15.15-17.45 (Roof Terrace Room)

SC2 - Thursday, 20 August 2015, 9.45-11.15 (Room 1.63/1.64)

Present:
Harriet Aagaard, Marie Balikova, Elise Conradi, John DeSantis, Gordon Dunsire, John Hostage, Ulrike Junger, Sally H. McCallum, Chris Oliver, Rehab Ouf, George Prager, Sandy Roe, Ana Stevanovic, Tiiu Tarkpea, Elena Zagorskaya, Maja Žumer

Absent: Mauro Guerrini, Lynne Howarth, Minyoung Hwang, Sun Mi Kim, Aida Slavic, Wen Song, Janis L. Young, Ekaterina Zaytseva

Observers: Aboubacar (Indian Ocean Commission), Lumka Andries, Julianne Beall, Musa A. Bello, Maria Violeta Bertolini, Marta Cichoń, Barbora Drobíková, Grazyna Federowicz, Agnese Galeffi, Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, Anita Goldberga, Jihae Jeon, Natalya Lelikova, Jobela Lungiswa, Dorothy McGarry, Tanja Mercun, Tholakele Xulu Monas, Miriam Nauri, Ifeoma Stella Njoku, Radka Rimanova, Pat Riva, Miriam Säfström, Ricardo Santos, Miyuki Tsuda

SC1

1. Welcome and introductions of the SC and observers
   1.1 Outgoing members are Marie Balikova, Gordon Dunsire, John Hostage, Sun Kim, Wen Song, and Janis Young
   1.2 New incoming members are Sally McCallum and Aida Slavic
       Apologies were received from Mauro Guerrini, Lynne Howarth, Janis Young, and Ekaterina Zaytseva

2. The agenda was approved with one addition, 9.2. Elise Conradi and Harriet Aagaard will give a report regarding the work of the EDUG (European Dewey User Group).

3. Elections and nominations

   3.1 Election process. Election process is available on the IFLA website
       (http://www.ifla.org/officerscorner/election-procedure) as are descriptions of the

responsibilities of the officers (Chair and Secretary) (http://www.ifla.org/officers-corner/sc-members)

3.2 Chair

A nomination and second was received for Maja to serve a second term as Chair; Maja accepted.

3.3 Secretary

A nomination and second was received for Sandy to serve a second term as Secretary; Sandy accepted.

3.4 Information coordinator (web page and maintenance/edits)

3.5 Newsletter editor

There was discussion about the value of re-combining the roles of Information Coordinator and Newsletter Editor. (They had been combined until the SC meetings in San Juan in 2011.) John Hostage agreed that the positions could be combined if someone is willing. Things have become easier, you don't need to know much about coding, for example. The primary challenge is soliciting and obtaining content. Harriet supports the idea of combining the two roles, and volunteered for Information Coordinator with both web and newsletter responsibilities.

Maja proposed that the two positions be combined, with the suggestion that this could be revisited during the next election cycle. Harriet has done a lot of work and been willing to try new things. If she is willing, Maja would like to see her return. Harriet accepted the position as Information Coordinator in this new combined role.

Harriet asked what our section wants from an Information Coordinator. IFLA wants us to twitter, write blogs, and promote the section and its activities on Facebook. While these things are good, they don't necessarily support the work of the section. John DeSantis put up a Facebook event page about our Section. We should keep on discussing what we should do to both promote the section and to support the work of the section.

4. Approval of minutes of the Lyon meetings, 2014 (posted as draft on the web). Minutes were approved. The Secretary will send the Information Coordinator a new version with the draft status removed, and the Information Coordinator will post the revised document.

5. Financial report.
   5.1 Admin funds. Basically we can only do printing with this money which is of little use. It used to be that the SC had more options to use the money. There has been no activity this year in financials.
   5.2 Project funds. We currently have no funded projects.

6. Division/Professional committee report. The Division III meeting is tomorrow morning at 8:30, and we will bring information from it to the second standing committee meeting.
   IFLA is in negotiations with De Gruyter now regarding the Green series (*IFLA Publication Series*), it is expected to continue but to be under different rules. That series will not be available as open access but they could not say more because of the negotiations.

The Red series (*IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control*) has ceased. All standards published in the future will be available as open access.

IFLA Journal will only be available online. There will be a call for a theme issue at some point in the coming year. Recommendations for conference papers are no longer solicited from the Sections. Any conference papers may be submitted by the authors, but they should know that significant revision is required (30%) and the paper must be given a new title (see http://blogs.ifla.org/literacy-reading/2015/09/22/publishing-in-iflas-journal/).

Satellite meeting papers will be added to IFLA Library, all poster sessions will be included, and the metadata will be improved. IFLA Library remains a work in progress.

Rehab: Last year we discussed having the collective knowledge that we have from Knowledge Organisation, Cataloguing, Bibliography, and Classification & Indexing – and also our standards – included in the IFLA Library. Maja: The assumption is that all of the standards are included in the IFLA Library. Gordon: Has IFLA HQ abandoned the idea of retrospectively loading the past conference papers? There should be a single point of access, and that should be IFLA Library. There are huge quantities of retrospective papers. Maja: That question was not addressed this morning. Maja will ask to tomorrow.

The Committee on Standards will begin to review the Guidelines for standards as the review cycle is up.

Basecamp and SurveyGizmo will be acquired by IFLA to support the cooperative projects and so on. They are also looking at online conference and webinar tools.

A draft of the next Strategic Plan / Key Initiatives for 2015-2016 was distributed. We can take these as a model for our Section's Strategic plan. We will have to come up with our own plan as has been done two years ago (see http://www.ifla.org/publications/classification-and-indexing-section-action-plan?og=70). Maja proposes a small working group to look at the past plan, look at new key initiatives, and discuss at the next meeting and also by email in the hope that we can finalize our plan by the end of this calendar year.

Harriet Aagaard, Elise Conradi, Sally McCallum, Rehab Ouf, George Prager, Sandy Roe, and Maja Žumer agreed to form a working group that would meet during this IFLA Congress regarding our next action plan. Maja: A time will be discussed.

Key initiatives – Maja sees a lot of emphasis on IFLA representing libraries to the outside world – very valuable and important work but what she misses is support/help for libraries to develop and increase their effectiveness. There is the Standards Committee, but she misses a bit more. From the perspective of our section, for example, what Maja notices—is that most of the development in subject access is happening outside libraries, and we are not following or keeping an eye on those developments. The former Bibliographic Control sections have a particular role in that regard, and there should be more in the key initiatives (in addition to what's already there, of course). All of this would maintain the position and future of libraries.

Rehab: This relates to our discussion about the new name of the section.

We will all get a link to a webpage there we can submit suggestions to IFLA's draft Strategic plan / key initiatives.

7. Section Development since the last meeting

    7.1 Working Groups

        7.1.1. Genre/form WG: A written report has been submitted by George. Shortly before the last conference the group worked on a survey for national libraries regarding genre/form developments. At Lyon, they decided to deconstruct that survey by libraries that were using genre/form, and that weren't using genre/form. An introductory letter was also written. Those have not been distributed. George is planning a WG meeting after SC2. It will be difficult for him to continue as Chair (he can continue as co-chair or definitely as a member. WG members are: Harriet Aagaard, Lynne Howarth, Bobby Bothmann, Marie Balikova, Ulrike Junger, Rehab Ouf, Ana Stevanovic, Patrick Le Boeuf, Elena Zagorskaya, and Victoria Lunburg.

        Miriam Säfström (new chair of Cataloguing SC): Can we get more members from Cataloguing?

        George will follow up with those rotating off, and recruit others. A co-chair from Cataloguing would be great, for example. Janis was on the WG – hopefully, she will continue as a member of the working group. Säfström will send an email to recruit other members from the Cataloging SC.

        Our SC2 meeting will have to be shorter than scheduled because it partly overlaps with the Cataloguing Open Program.

        7.1.2. Subject access in the new environment. We never made any specific plans about it, and instead have focused on the upcoming satellite conference. The topic of the satellite conference is in line with the WG, and so for the time being the preconference is the mission of the WG. The members of the WG will be the planning committee for the satellite meeting but of course we are accepting other new volunteers. Whoever is willing to continue or join the group, please contact Maja.

    7.2 Report on other actions undertaken by the Section in 2014/2015

        Corresponding member volunteers:

            Marie Balikova, Czech Republic

            Maria Camila Restrepo Ferniandez, Medellin-Colombia (email request)

            Ms. Miyuki Tsuda, Japan (email request from last election cycle)

        7.2.1. Satellite Conference in Columbus, working title, "New Developments in Providing Subject Access". The State Library of Ohio will be the location. It is in Columbus, Ohio. Athena Salaba has been nominated to chair Local Arrangements, and is a member of the Program committee. The satellite conference will be 1 ½ days – all day Thursday and Friday morning -- just before the IFLA Congress. The call has to go out sometime before October, Maja thinks (that what it was for Tallinn). Proceedings/papers will go into IFLA Library. If that doesn't work (IFLA Library), they we will have to look for another publication venue. The satellite meeting has been accepted and is already on the list (http://2016.ifla.org/programme/satellite-meetings). It is up to us to make it a success.

7.2.2. FRBR Review Group – Chris Oliver

The Review Group will have two business meetings, Sunday, 2-4 and Monday 2-4 – both immediately following the ISBD Review Group meetings in rooms 2.4.4 / 2.4.1. There is also an all-day meeting on Friday devoted entirely to the consolidated model – provisionally called FRBR LRM (Library Reference Model). If you want to come, just let Chris know so that she can give you directions to the Centre for the Book.

In 2013, the FBRB Review Group created the CEG (Consolidation Editorial Group) and they have led the work of defining the model and preparing the drafts. The CEG currently consists of three members, Pat Riva, Maja Žumer, and Patrick Le Boeuf. The CEG has prepared documents that the Review Group will discuss here in Cape Town. Right now the documents are internal to the review group. Because the full Review Group has been involved all along, the CEG does not expect any radical revisions. The RG hopes to send drafts to the Standing Committees (Classification and Indexing, Cataloguing, Bibliography) before the end of 2015 and send the model for worldwide review in early 2016. The CEG had two face-to-face meetings since the last WLIC and these meetings were very important in advancing the work. Face-to-face meetings are crucial when something so abstract is under discussion. The CEG is planning another face-to-face meeting in October to incorporate the comments and revisions that may result from the all-day meeting in Cape Town. The draft consolidated model will have its first unveiling at the Cataloguing Open Programme here in Cape Town, in a presentation given by Pat Riva and Maja Žumer.

FRBRoo and PRESSoo have gone for worldwide review. In Lyon the Review Group supported two statements endorsing the validity of the relationship between FRBRoo ver. 2.0 and PRESSoo with the FRBR family of conceptual models. At the same meeting, the Review Group decided to take FRBRoo and PRESSoo through the IFLA approval process to have them formally recognized as IFLA standards. These two models are object oriented interpretations of the FRBR model, and they were developed as extensions of the CIDOC CRM (conceptual reference model), the model developed by ICOM for the museum community. The two models did go through the step of world-wide review during the spring of 2015. Comments were received and responses to the comments are now being prepared. However, since FRBRoo was developed in dialogue with the CIDOC CRM Special interest Group, changes to it need to be discussed with them as well. There will be a new updated version of FRBRoo. Since PRESSoo is an extension of FRBRoo, there is little point in pushing one model through the approval process before work on the other one is completed. Bringing FRBRoo and PRESSoo into the IFLA family of standards is extremely important for data interoperability between the library and museum communities.

During the 2014 business meeting, the RG discussed the proposal from the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) for the Development of RDA to have a protocol agreement between the two groups in order to establish formal communication channels. Up until now, communication has been maintained informally, mainly through the fortuitous accident of overlapping memberships. The JSC prepared a preliminary document. The Review Group suggested revisions to some of the text. The JSC accepted the revisions and the protocol is in effect since March 31st, 2015, published on their website.

Namespaces work was completed for FRBRoo ver. 2.0. The intellectual work was completed prior to the IFLA conference in 2014, but there were issues with scheduling the upload to the Open Metadata Registry. The upload was completed before the end of 2014.

Due to changes in the way that the Committee on Standards operates and in its membership, now the Chairs of IFLA standards groups are formally invited to attend the meetings of the Committee on Standards as non-voting members. Receiving this formal recognition of the role of standards work is very important. The Chair (or delegate) of the FRBR Review Group was invited to the two meetings of the Committee on Standards, and has just come from the first meeting. During the first meeting, the Committee on Standards announced that they plan to work with the review groups and other IFLA standards groups to re-align their governance and reporting structures. The Committee on Standards will be contacting the Chairs during the fall. IFLA is looking at possible new models for making the relationship between standards producing groups and IFLA's governance structure more uniform and formal.

George: How closely is FRBRoo tied to FRBR, are you trying to make it more compatible?

FRBRoo deals with bibliographic data for which the museum community had no modelling, hence their interest in extending their model to include bibliographic data. FRBRoo is compatible with FRBR because it is based on FRBR model. FRBRoo is a reinterpretation of the FRBR family of conceptual models. Patrick Le Boeuf will give an overview of FRBRoo at the Cataloguing Section open programme.

7.3. Newsletter

7.3.2. Joint Metadata Newsletter.

Maja has heard that it was a big success. There was some concern that the Sections lost some branding. Maja disagrees in that it attracts a wider audience. She would like to thank Harriet again for all her efforts.

Harriet: It would be a good thing if you send comments, talk to Harriet during the meeting, send emails, etc. How do you want the newsletter to be? It is very important that you all contribute, otherwise there will be no interesting newsletter. If the other sections make a lot of contributions and there is nothing for subject access/classification then that doesn't look very good. At 5:45 after the C&I section meeting we will have a joint celebration with the Cataloguing & Bibliography sections to toast the first issue of our new Metadata newsletter. Sally: it sounds like an excellent idea to bring more attention in some way to our newsletter content. Chris Oliver: Last December Pat was writing a progress report on the consolidated FRBR model, a report that needed to be in the newsletters of both Cataloguing and Classification & Indexing, and it was not obvious whether the same content could be in both; Chris is looking forward to the joint newsletter. It would be great to have reports of new developments, reports from interesting conferences, and so on, not to summarize everything but to look for proceedings, something of interest at national library conferences. This should be encouraged and done more. Gordon: There is a danger that each of the sections will

lose their identity. Harriet alluded to that earlier when she said that if there is nothing from Classification & Indexing then the section disappears. He does advise caution. What frequency should the newsletter have? Tiiu: I am interested in Bibliography, Classification & Indexing, and Cataloguing and so having it together is enjoyable for her; she enjoyed this first issue. Harriet: Should we do one separately, and one jointly, continue only our own, or abandon our own? Gordon: remember that there used to be a communication channel – Universal Bibliographic Control, it was not provided by IFLA but was allowed to die away (remember the history). Pat Riva: The subscriptions for the print journal, International Cataloguing and Bibliographic Control (ICBC) were supposed to cover the costs but that's a very different situation than the newsletter for which there is no paid staff.

What was the conversation at the other two SCs? Miriam Säfström (Cataloguing SC Chair): the Cataloguing SC wanted to talk about it more; we have other means of communicating as a section (webpage, blogs, etc.). Users are likely to be less interested in the ways that we organize ourselves, than in the content. We have not decided on a future path. Miriam Nauri (Bibliography SC Chair): the main issue for the Bibliography SC was that they need to improve their communication; they support the continuation of this initiative.

Miriam Säfström: The Cataloguing SC wants to do more things together with other SCs, including something fun. Joint open sessions, working groups, there are many other things.

10 minute break.

7.3.3 Blog / Harriet

As you have noticed there are not many entries in the Classification & Indexing Section Blog, and that is because I need you to send more information. You can send me anything of interest, and I will put it on the blog and/or in the newsletter and/or ask you to expand what you send. If you don't feel fluent in English, I will help or will get someone to help. The main thing is to send information. She'll send an email about this in September (she has a holiday in August).

Elise: Where is the blog? Harriet: It is at http://blogs.ifla.org/ci/. I will make certain that the blog is linked from the C&I Section website.

7.4 New name of the section

Maja: Are we ready to propose something new?

John DeSantis: 'Classification' is important to retain, and 'subject access' would be good to replace 'indexing' – Subject Access and Classification (SAC). One of the purposes of classification is also subject access.

Sally: Subject and classification access

Rehab: The word must be more generic now that we are talking about vocabularies, tools, systems, the new trends with BIBFRAME, etc. Any name should include the word

'vocabularies'—it is understandable and intersects with all these changes. It is more oriented to bibliographic control, controlled lists of authority files, linked data.

Ulrike: If I remember correctly we were talking about switching the focus to the output, the purpose – rather than the tools. "Subject Cataloging and Access" – would do that for English speakers and encompass all the activities that lead to subject access, including access to table of contents which is something very important in my library.

Maja: "Subject cataloging" might also describe the tools

Tiiu: We need to imply the purpose, not just the tools.

Elena: 'Subject cataloging' means only subject heading access in her language (Russian). This phrase is not enough, only half, as it does not include classification.

Maja: Working on FRSAD really made her realize all the language problems. In my language "subject cataloging" means "cataloging on content."

Elise: I agree that it is important to focus on output. We have many tools. We should not be rooted in just these two tools -- -full text mining, and so forth. Subject access is the main goal.

Rehab: I agree. Focus on what you are doing, and not the tools. I have a problem with 'access' because it means the use, not the development for the use. 'Developers' not 'users' and therefore 'access' is not really correct in our language.

John DeSantis: While 'subject cataloging' is descriptive, then there is confusion with the existing cataloguing committee.

Miriam Säfström (Cataloguing Section Chair): Of course that's an aspect but you should choose a name that works for you. The Cataloguing Section has no plans to changing our name.

Mariam Nauri (Bibliography Section Chair): We do plan to change our name and we will talk about it later this conference because we think 'Bibliography'is no longer understood.

Massimo: In music libraries, we changed the name from cataloging commission to cataloging & metadata, but I did not like it. If the cataloging commission changes its name, then it is ok to have the word cataloging in this name. Otherwise I really get confused.

Sally: I wasn't sure what this group did based on its name.

George: Should we set a deadline and vote on it?

Maja: We have some proposals, maybe that's the starting point. Proposals include:

- Subject and classification access
- Subject cataloging and access
- Something including 'vocabularies'
- Subject access and classification
- Subject and genre access (Maja: no, no, no; genres belong in Cataloguing.)
- Subject access

Let's continue to brainstorm on email, and try to reach a decision by the end of the calendar year. Do you want to shoot for the Nov/Dec board meetings? Or, April? The April agenda is pretty booked. Otherwise we need to work really fast to have something ready by Nov.

John Hostage: I am not sure that we'll get more clarity on email. I like 'subject access' or just that we leave it as it is.

Elise: It doesn't in any place in our mandate say classification or indexing but subject access.

Maja: I will start an email discussion in September.

8. Section's Action Plan (2015-2016)

Maja: We have a group that will discuss the time of meeting before the toast (celebration following).

8.1. Presentation of work done last year. Nothing to add.

8.2 Webpage

The IFLA webpage will be redesigned. John Hostage will work with Harriet on the transition.

8.3 Establishment of new working groups

The report from the Bibliography Section's Project Working Group Meeting on *Best Practice for National Bibliographic Agencies in a Digital Age* was launched today by National Bibliography section. Perhaps we could liaise to include / revise *Guidelines for Subject Access in National Bibliographies* to augment the current "Subjects standards" section of the *Best Practice…* which is currently quite brief (see http://www.ifla.org/best-practice-for-national-bibliographic-agencies-in-a-digital-age/node/9036).

MulDiCat

Maja: It is really ours still.

Miriam Säfström: The Cataloguing SC discussed it and last year it was decided that the Cataloguing, Classification & Indexing, and Bibliography sections should together write to the Committee on Standards. That did happen and it was delivered to the Committee on Standards on Sept. 22, 2014. From Patrice's reaction today at the Committee on Standards, nothing has happened. So, we need to raise this question. MulDiCat is a powerful tool. We need to start again and keep pushing the Committee on Standards. Miriam Säfström is a member of the Committee on Standards and will keep pushing. It is important.

9. Overview of the Cape Town Conference Programme

9.1 Open Programme (Harriet Aagaard)

Our open session, *Dynamic Subject Access: Evolution and Transformation,* will be from 4-6 on Tuesday in Auditorium 2. We had 10 papers submitted, 3 papers were selected (see http://library.ifla.org/view/conferences/2015/2015-08-18/597.html). We added a keynote speaker, Thom Hickey from OCLC who will speak on WorldCat and VIAF and concentrate on subject access. Marie Balíková will present. We will also have Malarvele Ilangovan from the Singapore National Library Board, as well as a presentation from Eno J. Ottong of the University of Uyo in Nigeria – she

was at the Cataloguing Section meeting this morning. I hope to get the three papers all translated into French but that is not the case yet. We have one translation already – the Nigerian paper. You can see on the website when some translation has been begun, when it has finished. All papers are translated into Spanish. Marie's paper has been translated into Russian. If anyone can help with translations, please do.

Maja: Thanks to the program committee. Harriet was amazing, and managed to get the papers submitted on time. That was really great.

9.2 [European Dewey User Group](#) (EDUG)

Elise: The EDUG is an interest group for Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) users in Europe, there are 9 institutional members and 9 affiliated members. The group now has a new website where anyone can comment, post problems, or questions. See Forums (http://edug.pansoft.de/tiki-forums.php). EDUG has an annual workshop. This year it was on mapping to and from DDC, and Stella Dextra-Clark was invited to speak. It is an active group. Harriet has written about EDUG in the newsletter.

10. 2016, Columbus conference Plans (13-19 August), Theme: "Connections, collaboration, community" Let's begin the discussion. What are your thoughts, what topics? Should we hold it on our own or liaise with another section?

    George: Collaborate with another group, perhaps the Audiovisual or Indigenous sections. Indigenous law classification, indigenous knowledge organizations; big data mining; automatic means of providing subject access; folksonomies/communities. The draft title of our 2016 satellite meeting is, "Subject Access in the New Environment."

    Harriet: It would be good to have a different topic for the open session, perhaps all automatic means of subject access. During SCII we have to decide whether to try to liaise; whether to have combination of invited and open call for papers, etc.

SC2

Attendance sheet circulating. No introductions

This meeting will last just one hour because of the start time for Cataloguing Open Programme.

11. Discussion/Evaluation of Cape Town Conference

     11.1 Open programme evaluation
     Harriet: 80 people were present at the start, and 10-20 more came into our Open Programme as it progressed. I was pleased with the variety of the publications. Rehab: The Singapore presentation was really difficult. Harriet: It may be because I have been working in public libraries that I found it interesting. They use metadata from DDC and LCSH to make easy and attractive shelf displays in the library.

     Maja: The program committee did a great job in selecting quite a variety. It was a good idea to have a keynote, it is something we control, we can say we want this topic dealt with and we can make certain that someone does it. Also it was important that there were speakers from Africa. I

tis difficult to do a lot in a 2 hour slot, something IFLA might want to consider. We want to thank Harriet for this enormous work. I don't remember another occasion when all the papers were submitted on time.

John DeSantis: I want to compliment Harriet on the time management of the programme – 3 speakers + keynote + time for questions was just the right amount. An audience of 80-100 was far more than expected because it was just before the Cultural evening.

11.2 Overall organization

Elise: There were a lot of conflicts, and so I missed some that she wanted to go to but then had lots of free time. The most difficult was the conflict between the Classification & Indexing SCII and the Cataloguing Open Programme.

Sally: This has been a very positive meeting, and the conference center worked very well, very comfortable, technical things all went well.

Maja: The conference was smaller this year. She heard that there were 3,000 including 1,300 South Africans.

John Hostage: Technically it was very good; there were microphones in every meeting. If there had also been power strips for people to plug into that would be good.

George: Nice conference center, comfortable temperatures, lots of seating, lots of restaurants.

Rehab: The meeting rooms were close together, unlike in Lyon where they were more spread out.

Maja: A good value.

12. IFLA Matters

13. Unfinished business of updates from the first meeting

13.1 Action Plan
Our little group on the Action Plan met, and we discussed a draft. The Key Initiates are still in draft and so we did not align our revision with the draft key initiatives. It was mostly looking at the 2013-2014 period and seeing how we can adjust. Sandy has prepared the draft, if the group has comments send them soon, and then it will go out to the whole group – knowing that it will have to be adjusted when the new key initiatives are approved. Watch for that email. Maja & Sandy will map the existing text to the new initiatives when they come out and then we will post to the web. Please give comments when you see it.

13.2 Officers' brief

Maja: Discussed the web page, and tools that will be made available. They have just begun considering how they will proceed with the website, nothing immediate. IFLA HQ has purchased two tools and hope that both will become available sometime in October. They are Basecamp, a project management software something like Google Docs, and SurveyGizmo, similar to

SurveyMonkey. Any projects from that time on will be able to use Basecamp. If a WG or SC wants to do a survey, we have to notify HQ and get assigned a time slot. There will be no particular support for either tool. IFLA will provide a basic information sheet but aren't planning to run a support team. Anyone needing help will have to contact the respective software company. Sally: If we said that we wanted to send a survey to all members of our SC will someone else load the respondent lists? Maja: I believe that we will have to load whatever list is appropriate to the survey.

Maja: We will ask that a mailing list be created for the members of the Standing Committee

Rehab: Will we be using Basecamp if we want to share documents? Maja: I don't think so, generally, but a working group might want to use it. George: We can use other tools instead, right? Maja: Yes, that was made explicit.

13.3 Communication plan

Harriet: As the new Information Coordinator, I think that we need to make a formal communication plan.

Maja: Harriet, are you willing to create the first draft? Please send it to the whole standing committee, we will send deadlines for comments, and move forward. We are all full of good intentions when we are here, and then difficult to keep things going.

13.4 Columbus Conference Plans, 2016

Maja: Did you all think about a topic for our Open Programme, and about teaming up with others? Three were suggested in SC1: Something with Indigenous sources/content in collaboration with the Indigenous SIG, 2) automatic tools in subject access, and 3) user driven subject access

Elise: The second and third could just as easily be folded into the Satellite meeting but not the first.

Rehab: The first topic would be really very successful because it falls under the … rich and joyful. In my library and the specialized centers that are attached to it, we do a lot of work attached to cultural heritage, and I suspect that many others have similar. When you think about subject access, this is an area that is really focused and rich. Harriet: Have we had any communication with the Indigenous SIG? Maja: No. Whoever is appointed the committee chair will of course have to ask them. We could liaison with them and have a longer session, or if they have other plans we could still have it on our own. When you want to join forces with another section it is very difficult to run after other chairs. George: When you do a joint program do you automatically get more time? Maja: Yes, generally. John Hostage: The Indigenous matters SIG is meeting now across the hall. So, we need to designate a Programme Committee. George, Rehab, Chris Oliver, John DeSantis volunteered but do put out a call (and volunteer Lynne Howarth) so that those not here could also volunteer. Rehab: I know that it takes time to distribute the minutes of the meeting, but please send a list of those on committees quite soon. John DeSantis is named convener to get the ball rolling with this group. As soon as possible, John, please contact the Indigenous Matters SIG.

Photo taken of both incoming and outgoing SC members.

Satellite meeting plans—

Those who are willing to volunteer for the Satellite meeting program, we will meet right after the Cataloguing Program outside of the official entrance on this floor (Auditorium 1). The topic is novel ways of subject access. Title suggestions are welcome. Maja: We need something very interesting. Think about it. Rehab: The title of the Tallinn satellite meeting was very good.

14. Other business

John DeSantis: Is there a formal procedure for changing the name of a Section? Maja: The Bibliographic Section is looking at something similar, and are looking for advice. I did not want to ask HQ too far in advance, but will approach HQ when we know what we want.

Elise: I nominate that the new name be: Standing Committee on Subject Access

Sally: From 2013, the mission statement consistently says "subject access" and so Elise's proposal resonates with me as well.

Maja: We should take a programmatic approach; she will invite a few people to discuss it and formulate it as a proposal and then we will put that out for discussion. At this point we have probably identified all of the alternatives. Let's narrow to 2 or 3, and put those out and get a decision by December. If we give it more time, there will be no added value.

Maja: I would like more activity on our standing committee mailing list. Have any thoughts occurred to you on important topics? If you go home and have ideas in retrospect, please share them. Harriet will be asking for more contributions (she won't be back at work until Sept. 7). She will post the final minutes that Sandy has sent after she returns. As I said at the first meeting, please send information suitable for publishing on the blog, the website, and the newsletter to the newsletter editor. Being newsletter editor is not about writing everything herself.

Project funding: George is the only working group eligible for funding, is the group planning to apply for funding? George: Not at this point but we are getting going again and it looks promising. Maja: The funding is typically not too much but it does help out. When you want to request funding, the best time is before the December PC meeting. They now say that they do accept applications at a later time as well (April) but you run the risk that all funds will be already allocated. If you apply in April, it must be spent by the end of that calendar year.

Harriet: What about the Bibliography committee's request that we supply information on subject access for their report, *Best Practice for National Bibliographic Agencies in a Digital Age*? Maja: Sally will you be willing to look into this? We will probably draft something and send it out? Yes, Sally and Sandy have agreed.

Maja: Thank you very much for coming and for helping to manage our limited time so efficiently. Let's consider doing a Skype meeting sometime in spring.