IFLA
Division III - Library Services
Classification and indexing Section

Standing Committee Meetings
80th IFLA General Conference and Council
Lyon

Minutes of meetings

SC1 - Saturday, 16 August 2014, 15:15-17:45 (Rhône 2)

SC2 – Thursday, 21 August 2014, 11:30-13:00 (Bellecour 2)

Present: Harriet Aagaard, Marie Balikova, Elise Conradi, John DeSantis, Gordon Dunsire, Mauro Guerrini, John Hostage, Lynne Howarth, Ulrike Junger, Chris Oliver, Rehab Ouf, George Prager, Sandy Roe, Wen Song, Ana Stevanovic, Tiiu Tarkpea, Janis L. Young, Elena Zagorskaya, Ekaterina Zaytseva, Maja Žumer

Absent: Minyoung Hwang, Sun Mi Kim

Observers: Radia Abuzail, Viktoria Barsukova, Julianne Beall, Juliya Borie, Françoise Bourdon, Vincent Boulet, Libbie Crawford, Matias Frosterus, Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi, Rachid Ghoufary, Angela Green, Robert P. Holley, Patrice Landry, Mikko Lappalainen, Patrick Le Boeuf, Tatiana Maskhuliya, Dorothy McGarry, David C. McQuillan, Tanja Merain, Jean-Hughes Morneau, Susanna Mykyri, Satu Niininen, Tadahiko Oshiba, Federica Paradisi, Pat Riva, Lana Soglasnova, Vesa Suominen, Pirjo Tuomi, Kiti Vilkki-Eriksson, Jay Weitz

SC1

1. Welcome and introductions of the SC and observers
    Maja welcomed everyone to the meeting, standing committee members and observers introduced themselves, and a sign-in sheet was passed around.

2. Approval of the agenda
    The agenda was approved.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Singapore Meetings, 2013
    The minutes from Singapore were published as draft on the Standing Committee web page, and were approved as is. The draft statement will be removed, and we will plan to post the minutes from Lyon as draft in this same way following IFLA.

4. Financial report
4.1 Admin funds. This year Admin funds have been reduced from $300 to $150 per standing committee because most were not spending it, including this standing committee.

4.2 Project funds. Namespaces was the only project for which funds were requested. It was not funded, and it will not be funded as a project in future (Gordon will talk about this in his report). The call for project funds will be out in October again this year. Patrice was not explicit but in the Cataloguing SC he mentioned that there would be some changes. Maja is assuming that our two SC working groups may consider some project funding for meetings. By the time the call is out in fall, we should know more about what the procedure will be.

5. Report from the Division & Professional Committee
Today we had the officers' training session and a few of the things that were brought up were:

- Everyone should look at the [IFLA Trend Report](#)
- The [Lyon Declaration](#) is available now but will be officially launched on Monday. If you are able to sign for your institution, please do so.
- There are two upcoming IFLA Market sessions for which someone from each SC needs to attend, and then report in the next SC meeting: Session 67D Producing IFLA standards – a "how to" session for IFLA units, and Session 67B Professional activities - what makes an IFLA unit successful?
  Maja will attend the standards one. Sandy volunteered to attend the second.

This coming year is a nomination one. Those who are eligible for a second term, make sure you find an IFLA C&I Section member to nominate you. When you serve you represent yourself, not your employer or the member that nominated you.

IFLA is looking at the structure of the organization because it's been many years since the last restructuring. They will evaluate and see whether any amendments are needed. Because of this evaluation of the organization's structure, I am wondering whether this is the time to discuss the name of the section. We talked about it last year, and we all said that 'Classification & Indexing' does not resonate well in our current environment. Have you been thinking about it; do you have any suggestions? Would "Standing Committee on Subject Access" be understood by the outside community? If there were an easy solution, we would have already had it.

The Division had a Skype meeting in the spring and surprisingly it worked well - even with 20 people. It showed again what had already been obvious at the meeting in Singapore; our Division is very heterogeneous, and could be labelled as "Other" because we have bibliographic control, indigenous populations, knowledge organization, children's services, reference services, etc. We have been discussing for some while the added value of this division structure if there are such huge differences. We asked for some way of working closer with the former Bibliographic Control Division, and already we have come together to organize the open session

that will be held here in Lyon. The Division chair is listening and quite receptive to our work. If there is anything that you feel needs to be brought to the division meeting tomorrow, please let me know.

6. Section Development since the last meeting

6.1 Working Groups

6.1.1 Namespaces Technical Group (NTG)

Gordon Dunsire: The NTG has been funded as a project by IFLA for 3 years, and at the end of each year the group has been told that the PC will consider more permanent funding. This year when they applied for project funding, the decision of the PC was not to give any funding to the NTG but instead to begin a process to reorganize the group so that in future it would have a more permanent funding base. The outcome of the discussions of terms of reference, and so forth – the NTG will be off the books as of Wednesday at the close of this meeting. There is a meeting of the group on Wed. 1:15-3:45 (room Tête d'Or 1). The group published its guidelines and two draft guidelines on using IFLA namespaces and we expect the individual bodies to adopt these standards for their particular purposes, and a document on how to bridge between one namespace to another. FRBRoo – preparing for upload into the Open Metadata Registry. The ISBD also has a report on this, as they are also focusing on namespace, and the relationship between the ISBD Review Group and the Joint Steering Committee (JSC). Issues of what is now a non-existent IFLA group and the outside bodies to which it liaises. Gordon was asked and agreed to write a report that we can include in the C&I annual report that encapsulates the 4 year project, Namespaces.

6.1.2 Genre/Form Working Group

George Prager: The working group currently has 11 members including 8 from our Section, 1 from the Cataloguing Section, 1 from the FRBR Review Group, and 1 member from outside the two sections: George Prager (Chair), Marie Balikova, Ulrike Junger, Harriet Aagaard, Lynne Howarth, Rehab Ouf, Ana Stevanovic, Janis Young, Bobby Bothmann, Viktoria Lundborg, and Patrick Le Boeuf. We came up with 8 tasks (see http://www.ifla.org/node/8526). The Working Group is now working on developing a survey to national libraries about genre/form issues. We came up with a list of questions, and just put it into SurveyMonkey software. In Lyon we will meet after the SC2 to finalize the survey questions. After our preliminary test survey, we will send the finalized survey out to as many national libraries as we can get the names for. The group is also planning to create links between equivalent terms and various genre vocabularies.

Question: Did you want feedback? George: Yes, once the WG is OK with the list of survey questions, he will send it out for comments.

6.1.3   Subject Access in the New Environment WG

This Working Group on worldwide trends is currently comprised of Harriet Aagaard, Marie Balikova, Elise Conradi, Sandy Roe, Tiiu Tarkpea, and Maja Žumer (Chair). We used this year to decide what we wanted to do and what can be done; we haven't achieved much. We had a Skype meeting, we discussed over email. We did decide that our first step should be to get an overview of interesting developments in subject access. We are now actively seeking information on interesting things being done in subject access in national or other libraries – anything that goes beyond the traditional way. We will have an informal meeting of our group and will try to coordinate a time for it during Lyon, and are hoping to have more to report next year. We are open to suggestions and new volunteers.

Gordon: The Linked data satellite meeting seemed to be very successful, and one of the presenters expressed interest in MACS (Multilingual Access to Subjects) becoming the VIAF of subjects. Maja: I am aware of MACS, 70,000 mappings among RAMEAU for French, LCSH for English, and SWD for German. It is an incredible work, and something to follow. If you hear of anything interesting, please contact any of the members of the working group.

6.1.4   MulDiCat (Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloguing Terms and Concepts)

Maja: Work on MulDiCat has been stalled for some time. It has been part of C&I for administrative reasons. The situation is now that some infrastructure was developed to support editing, entering the terms and editing the vocabularies. During this time when RDA is being translated into multiple languages, and we have all these models that are also being translated, this resource could really be valuable. Talked with Cataloguing – it is an important project, it should go on, and perhaps the Standards Committee should be its natural home. Patrice agreed but said that he would like to settle everything with Namespaces, and then will go on to dealing with MulDiCat. We will still need a group to coordinate the ongoing work. Nothing has been decided yet on the structure. It would have to be something joined by or initiated by the Cataloguing Section with some membership on our part. Is anyone willing to take the lead on that?

Gordon: There are two operations that would have to be considered: 1) expanding the vocabulary. Currently MulDiCat only includes terms extracted from the International Cataloguing Principles (ICP) and has translated them into 17 languages. There are issues with some of the translations that would have to be resolved. The JSC for Development of RDA would also be interested in using MulDiCat. Beyond expanding it beyond the terms in ICP, and we also need 2) a maintenance regimen which may be quite difficult.

Cataloging code translations themselves are ad hoc. MulDiCat needs an infrastructure; it cannot continue ad hoc. I don't think the parameters of the problem have yet been identified. Gordon sees MulDiCat as a test case; it should be showcase for IFLA's multi-national, multi-lingual work in these areas. We need a lot more languages than 17. Maja: I suggest that we formally propose to the Standards Committee that they take it under their wing, and why they should. Gordon: I think the chair of the C&I Section and the chair Cataloguing Section should write the Chair of the Standards Committee about this matter – the translation of standards. It doesn't have to go into detail. Maja will talk to Chair of the Cataloguing Section and report at the next standing committee meeting.

6.1.5   Demonyms

Janis Young: Although she proposed this project two years ago in Helsinki her workload has not enabled her to get to it; she apologized. She asked, in Pittsburgh, you are a Pittsburgher – is there an equivalent of this in Chinese, other languages? Other than a few emails, and an attempt at a terms of reference, she hasn't been able to move forward. Is there another who is interested in taking it on?

Maja: We have had this working group on our action plan for 4 years now, but at the same time this situation is not unlike MulDiCat. It is again something that would need some organizational structure and some technical structure. If there is no urgent need, she would prefer to see how things go with MulDiCat and then consider pushing it on to the Standards Committee, possibly combining it with geographical terms.

Janis: I do think this is important, and she and Gordon had talked about it coming into MulDiCat – if you go the geographic route, how would it be distinct from VIAF? The technical structure is the same; when you are ready with the content, the carrier will be ready.

Maja: At that time we will need a coordinating body.

John DeSantis: Janis, you and I both sit on SAC (American Library Association's Subject Analysis Committee), and I know you have brought it up there. Any interest? Janis: SAC was very interested a couple years ago. The management group at the Library of Congress decided that the Policy & Standards Division would create some Library of Congress Demographic Group terms (this is by an architect, this is by a nurse, and so forth) – national and first level of jurisdiction … so the scope of the demonym project and that one, is somewhat different. Outcome: This project will be tabled until we see whether/how the Standards committee deals with MulDiCat.

[break and Standing Committee photo]

6.2 Report on other actions undertaken by the Section in 2013/2014

6.2.1 International Cataloguing Principles (ICP) revision group (out of Cataloguing SC)

Dorothy McGarry: After the work has been agreed upon, then the work will come to this SC and other groups, too, so we will have a chance to look at it before it goes out for worldwide review. Only 4 people are on that committee (Dorothy, Agnese, and two others). We will see it probably no later than September or October.

6.2.1 FRBR review group (Chris Oliver, chair)

Translations: Translations of FRBR into Arabic and Bulgarian have become available over the past year; FRAD has also been translated into Bulgarian.

Consolidation and harmonization: During WLIC 2013, the FRBR Review Group suggested to the Cataloguing SC that an editorial group be formed. The Cataloguing SC agreed and the Consolidation Editorial Group (CEG) was created. It includes Patrick LeBoeuf, Pat Riva, Miriam Säfström, and Maja Žumer. It worked well, with lots of intense work in the past year. The group expects to bring together the new model soon. The Review Group will hold its Business meeting on Sunday from 2-4pm in Tête d'Or 2, and then will also have an all-day 9:30-5:30 offsite meeting on Friday to discuss consolidation and the model emerging from the consolidation process. If you are interested in coming as an observer, please let Chris know and she'll tell you how to get to enssib (École Nationale Supérieure des Sciences de l'Information et des Bibliothèques) where the Friday meeting will be.

It was fortuitous to have CIDOC CRM meetings at the same place and time as the FRBR CEG so that the FRBR Review Group was well represented during discussions of FRBR/CRM harmonization. Harmonization is based on harmonizing FRBRoo (an object-oriented modelling of FRBR) with the CIDOC CRM because FRBRoo is an extension of the CRM model. FRBRoo v.2 is just coming out and incorporates FRAD and FRSAD entities, attributes, and relationships (v.1 was approved in 2008). The FRBR RG has endorsed PRESSoo (an extension of FRBRoo) noting both how the standard is in fact an interpretation of FRBR, and where the differences lie. PRESSoo was developed by representatives from the ISSN International Centre and the Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF).

The JSC contacted the FRBR Review Group about the possibility of developing a protocol between us in order to keep in step with regard to big changes happening in each area. This way we can formally stay in touch, not just by the accident of having the individual members in common that we do now.

6.2.2 Attracting new Section members

Our section needs to attract more institutional members to the Section. How? No response.

6.3 Section Newsletter (Harriet Aargaard)

Two newsletters (Dec. and June) have been published. She is grateful for everyone who has contributed, but would also like to ask all members of the section to contribute. She is sure that we all do interesting things in our libraries or countries. You don't have to write in good English, or if you want to write in another language we'll try to translate it. Conference reports or anything could be good. She is very fond of pictures, so send photos, please, because it makes a much more interesting newsletter to read. Are there suggestions regarding the newsletter?

Maja: All members should contribute per our action agenda. Reports don't have to be long but they draw attention and that's important, even if it is only something like, "for more information, see this webpage."

Harriet is also editor of the section's blog. There have been three posts by Gordon and six by Harriet, and a total of ten entries over this past year. She is not happy with the ability of the blog to come up as a result of a search. You could send things to her at any point during the year; they could be put in the blog immediately, and then reused in the newsletter.

Maja: This morning we were told that less than 1/3 of IFLA blogs are active at all.

6.4   Webpage (John Hostage)

John has posted the newsletters, announcements of meetings that will happen at the conference but not much else. Maja: all the established working groups should post. We also learned today that we can get analytics on the use of the webpage, so perhaps you might request those and see what parts are used if at all. Send information, and try to keep it up to date.

7. Section's Action Plan (2014-2015)
Maja proposes that she and Sandy will draft something and send it out to the group for comment. It will be along the same lines, we still need to specify the key initiatives that will be supported. Please let Maja know if there is anything specific that you would like to include; bring suggestions to the second Standing Committee meeting if you don't have any today. Lynne Howarth volunteered to assist.

Elise – The name of our section seems out of line when subject access is in every point in our mission statement.

8. Overview of the Lyon Conference Programme

   8.1 Open Programme (John DeSantis)

   Last year we spoke both of doing our own programme and also of combining our efforts but in the end he found himself coordinating a very large group. He acknowledged the individuals in this room -- Mauro, George, Lynne, Harriet – for their help with the process. They received many more papers than they were able to accommodate. Gordon stepped in and helped a great deal, particularly in setting up the schedule. At some point, Patrice approached John to see whether we received the same paper as the Standards Section (several Iranian papers had been submitted to both). One Iranian professor called to cancel (only one person from Iran registered for this conference), and said that a colleague would present for them. So we may be one paper short; if so, should it be pulled from the website? Almost all of the papers were translated (French to English and English to French) thanks to our wonderful colleagues at BnF. We had one of the highest percent of translated papers among the open sessions. The programme will take place all day on Monday with an hour break for lunch and two keynote speakers. Several volunteered for technical tasks during the session itself, and he thanks them for those. All papers have now been published, and only two have not been translated – one only because it arrived so late. It was an absolute pleasure to do this work, and he does anticipate a successful session. It is something that we should consider doing again in the future – not every year, and not with the same SCs (we might approach the AV Section, for example). Maja: Yes, otherwise, we move in the same circles and do the same thing every year. My only concern was maybe our original topic (use/reuse of metadata) did not really rise to the top. John DeSantis: some will touch on it. Maja: perhaps we might consider using the topic of use/reuse again in the future. We are all looking forward to that session.

9. 2015, Cape Town Conference Plans (15-21 August 2015)

   Theme: "Dynamic Libraries: Access, Development and Transformation"

   Maja: Planning the next year's programme, its theme, ideas, who to liaison with is really best done during the conference while we are all here in Lyon.

   Marie Balikova: In light of the overall theme for Cape Town suggests — *Dynamic Subject Access:* Development and Transformation.

   Maja: Also begin thinking about a satellite conference in 2016. We have something of a tradition of doing satellite meetings every 3 years, by 2016 it will be four years since Tallinn. We have to propose it this year already if we are going to have it in the U.S. We have contacts in Columbus and also at Kent State that is close (by American standards).

Other things?

Juli Beall: The International Dewey Users meeting will be on Tuesday, August 19 from 8:00-9:30 in this room. All are welcome, please come.

SC1 was adjourned at 17:31.

SC2

Introductions.

Bob Holley greeted us as one of the founding members of the section in 1981.

10. Discussion/Evaluation of Lyon Conference

10.1 Open programme evaluation

Maja: Thank you to the organizing committee for this big joint session. I know what an enormous effort this is, and would like to thank everyone for this valuable work, particularly to John DeSantis. I especially appreciated the introductions you gave in French.

John DeSantis: Not everything goes as we want it to. Although very successful; it was expected that one speaker would not attend, and that did occur which was fortunate as we did run short of time. It was unfortunate that we did not have time for any questions. Remember to take this into account for future planning, and schedule fewer papers. Force presenters to end on time (although this can be difficult). One pair of presenters went egregiously over time, and they were apologetic afterwards.

Maja: There was just one paper strictly on our (C&I) topics – an excellent paper, the Finnish one. In a way we would wish for more on our topic, but I understand you chose the best you could.

Lynne: The theme was strong enough to bring the papers together, and the programme was not disjointed as we were concerned that it might be. I would particularly like to thank two of the speakers, Gildas Illien and Françoise Bourdon, for the French language lesson on bibliographic control.

George: I took a count of the audience – approximately 220 people at the beginning of the morning, and approximately 207 in the afternoon.

Maja: Very good. Any more comments? It was an interesting experience to combine all these Standing Committees [Cataloguing, Bibliography, Classification & Indexing, and the UNIMARC Strategic Programme] but not something we would want to do every year.

10.2 Overall organization

Harriet: Some were not pleased with the translations, as not everyone is conversant in French. Maja did hear that some were not audible. Janis: I find myself confused by the translations and try to focus on the English slides instead. Several of the presentations made it well worth the entire day. John Hostage: My understanding is that IFLA uses volunteer translators; the

translation work is very specialized and not easy to do. It is a problem that people listening get half the content. It is my understanding that sometimes one translator is translating from another. Marie-France Plassard's translations are always of high quality.

John Hostage: WiFi should not have been blocked in the meeting rooms. Harriet: It was also a problem that you had to log into it which should not be.

Lynne: I would like to convey deep gratitude to the volunteers. They were consistently cheerful. Only one problem was when the volunteers were telling attendees that most of the opening session presentations would be in English, which they were not.

John Hostage: I agree that having to log in each time for the WiFi was a problem. The procedure for getting the headsets for translations was very inefficient. They scanned the barcode, wrote the number down, and then rescanned and re-recorded. This also required headsets to be returned to the same station where they were picked up.

Gordon: I was very disappointed to find the usual situation of no chairs for observers in the Standing Committee meetings and resulted in the usual 15 minutes of scrambling to find chairs. There are often more observers than members and chairs are needed. There was no presence in the program of the Working Groups when we are trying to make our work more visible, and recruit new people. There was no catering for these groups. Stairs were blocked off in the convention centre, signs pointed in opposite directions. Transportation for the cultural evening was basically a disaster.

Janis: If you needed to print something off, and unless you were a VIP, there were no facilities for doing that.

George: Having microphones available for IFLA SC meetings has been a great improvement, and having coffee and water available was also appreciated. Information about the cultural evening wasn't that readily available.

Maja: I am concerned that the term "cultural evening" did not really describe this particular event. It was a nice party. As a trend, the program is becoming more and more fragmented. This year there were many sessions off site and this should be a concern to IFLA. Once you have an offsite meeting, people have to register for it, and this really reflects on the whole experience of the conference. There were very few over-arching things that would make the conference more consistent, interesting, and cohesive.

11. IFLA matters

Report on how to make your unit a success

Report on Standards manual (concurrent with the meeting above)

Patrice: Since the launch of the standards manual, we are already revising it. Small things but important things. Regarding the [IFLA Library](#) – this is definitely in development; we are pushing the timetable to have a section on standards, a place for standards that have lapsed, a place for print standards that have been digitized. This is on our work plan for the coming year – to start organizing this IFLA Library so that it is not just conference papers but also includes what we need to do our work, such as standards. Continue to pressure IFLA HQ regarding IFLA Library. Use your Division Chair to do this; get that person working and use them when they are at Division meetings. Unfortunately for us, Joanne Yeomans' replacement (maternity leave) is still in the learning process. Joanne's mandate was to start developing the IFLA Library but that's been put on hold for a little bit.

Patrice: The Standards Committee is planning a satellite meeting for Cape Town on Aug. 13-14 at the University of the Western Cape. Work this into your work plan if you can – if you are about to produce a new standard or guideline, or have recently finished something – be sure that you are reaching out to your audience and getting feedback. If we have done something it needs to have a purpose. This is the message we want to get across – to make your work relevant. We must go the extra step to be in touch with those actually using our standards. The call for papers will come in Oct. or Nov.

Division III officers meeting (Maja Žumer)

During this meeting there was a break out session that paired us with the former Division IV sections. The Bibliography Section asked that we consider a common newsletter (not as a replacement but in addition). We all thought that it was a nice idea, and we'll see how things develop. It might be accomplished by selecting entries from each of our existing newsletters. The Bibliography Section will initiate further activities. IFLA Library was also a topic that came up, for example the content such as older papers and proceedings are not all there. But the majority of our comments were that the retrieval was not functional which makes it not a good reflection on IFLA. There is so much collective knowledge in all four sections that really could contribute to the improvement of the IFLA Library. We could offer our services. It isn't just doing it at the IFLA office, or hiring – we know. Our Division chair was very concerned about how we might package that reflection. So we'll see how things go.

12. Unfinished business or updates from the first meeting

12.1 2015 Cape Town Conference Plans

Maja: The Cataloging section program for 2015 will include PRESSoo, FRBRoo, and LAM (libraries, archives, and museums) as a general topic. Unless we want to address subject access in archives, we don't quite fit in there. My other thought is that our original plan for this year was on use/reuse of metadata; this was not really addressed by this year's open programme and so I feel that this topic is still open and could be used. Other comments?

Harriet: I don't think that we could participate in the PRESSoo or FRBRoo program, but I want to attend, of course. So, I think the use/re-use – the idea of making our data available to others and for us to use what is out there is a good one. Could we work with the AV or Bibliography sections? I want to attend the programme committee.

Pat Riva: The Bibliography Section talked about planning their programme on how the legal deposit of e-resources is affecting national bibliographies. They may contact the National Libraries group, and are considering an African speaker to do a keynote on something relevant to that topic.

Tiiu: We will have a satellite meeting in America in 2016, and so could cooperate with another section that year. I think we should cooperate with University research libraries for a program. Something about subject access, big data, data mining, open data.

Maja: we could contact them and see if they would be willing.

John DeSantis: Topics that encompass data and big data are big in the U.S. right now.

Harriet: I think that all the developers and technicians really think that big data is the answer; you will get subject access out of big data, out of digitized books (and therefore it is not important to provide subject access). In Sweden we do not digitize everything like they do in Norway. It is a really interesting subject, but we need to ascertain that we will include subject access, and not just big data.

Gordon: Subject access to specialized materials, such as A/V, legal deposit, specialized collections of materials. Maja: This is exactly a case of use/reuse. I agree that could be a good sub-topic.

Mauro: We have to work to develop access approach to the international cataloguing principles – the subject access part of ICP

Rehab: Bibliography, Cataloguing, and Classification & Indexing have a lot of areas that overlap but this section needs to have something more in depth – indexing, vocabularies from the point of view of systems, something more oriented to the section itself. The objective at the end is to reinforce this area. We are more inclined to be very specialized, to go into depth.

Maja: Joint sessions give you a bigger time slot and maybe the added value of looking at the topic from two points of view, but the disadvantage is that your specific topics may get lost in it. So, perhaps this coming year is the time to be on our own.

Lynne: At ASIS&T last year there was a full day of papers on big data, and it would fit very well within the theme of dynamic libraries.

Maja: Let's form a committee who will take one of these ideas and move it forward. Harriet, George, Maja, Elisa, and Ulrike all volunteered. Maja: The plan is we will go on to develop our

own programme, and communicate by email; unless we are contacted by another section. The call should probably go out during September or October? Should we ask for full papers, or just abstracts or extended abstracts? People will be more committed if we ask for full papers. We'll discuss it.

12.2 Satellite Conference in 2016 (IFLA will be in Columbus, Ohio, in the U.S.)

We have an offer from Kent State University to host a satellite conference either on their site or on their satellite campus in Columbus. Sandy volunteered to assist with local planning. We'll go with whatever place will work better for practical reasons – either Thursday and Friday morning or – well, it is still two years away. The Working Group on Subject Access in the Changing Environment had an idea about selecting novel ideas, wonderful ideas about subject access – these might make a good satellite meeting, so you would learn and know who to turn to. What do you think, or other proposals? Elise: Looking for good use cases that would allow others to return to their institutions and argue more successfully for subject access.

George: Is "revolutionizing" too strong? Elise: It might intimidate some people from submitting.

Maja: Estimate for number of contributors? Perhaps 150? We had around 100 in Tallinn.

Janis: If we go with something about genre/form, this topic is huge in the U.S. right now, and so we might get a whole lot of Americans there and would be good to err on the side of more than less. Other topics might include creating vocabularies, using vocabularies in new ways.

George: So it could also include papers on genre/form?

Maja: Yes, of course, as long as we are making sure that everyone understands that genres are not topics. We could have a broad call for papers, and then combine papers into clusters.

Volunteers for the programme for the satellite meeting… anyone? Lynne, John DeSantis, Janis, Harriet, Maja, and Sandy for local arrangements all volunteered. If you decide later that you would like to join either planning committee or working group, please just email your interest.

12.3 Project Proposals

Maja: Project funding is for 2 years, and so this year our WG will only do online meetings. Proposals are typically due in mid-November. George, how about your working group?

George: I don't believe that they will try to meet face to face during the coming year but the working group will be meeting today immediately after this meeting and they will consider it.

Maja: Any other projects coming? No. If there is anything let me know.

13. Other business

Lynne: I was very struck at this conference by sessions on services to marginalized communities and am wondering about the potential for considering a WG or project that looked at Guidelines for Subject Access for [fill in the blank]. So many of our subject access systems have been defined with the "core group" in mind, if I can put it that way. Lana Soglasnova spoke on the design of thesaurus within a workplace safety compensation environment. There was an indigenous, social justice, LGBT programme, and this is something that this section might think of. There are guidelines regarding sight disabilities. This is a huge area that we might want to explore in some way and to think about some way we might provide guidelines and pass them along in terms of best use, best case, best practice – a good way to liaise with other groups, to invite others to be part of our section, to be socially engaged.

Maja: A huge topic, which we would have to do one-by-one, case-by-case. Should we approach the sections dealing with those kinds of populations, and explore whether they feel any need for it, and offer our…

Lynne: We might enter into a dialogue. We don't want to condescend. We would want to talk with people in other sections – not specific to developing any systems, per say - but about what principles are important.

Maja: As a first step could we show our readiness. Lynne, could you begin?

Lynne: Sure, I could have some conversations.

Maja: OK, we'll see and then form a working group of some kind. Yes, please do. Does the standing committee agree? Yes (much head nodding)

Joanne Bélair asked John DeSantis to pass on her greetings.

Maja: Regarding the name of our section. We are all slightly unhappy with our current name. The terminology in this area is a bit imprecise. Understanding has eroded; both geographically and in different areas of our profession. It is considered old fashioned. What about, 'Section on Subject Access'?

Bob Holley: He doesn't remember what the original name was in 1981; the name was changed to current name in the 1980s. This Section did have a Satellite meeting in Columbus (at OCLC) in 2001.

Dorothy McGarry: She thinks that it was "Classification and Subject Cataloguing"

Elena Zagorsky: No, she does not agree to a name change. Consider how long the section has had its name. We need more discussion.

Maja – Yes, it is about identity.

Lynne: I think we have a classification problem here. I think the name has been perfect for the time that we've had it. But I'm struck by the topics of the programmes we've had. 'Subject access' brings in both structured and unstructured approaches to subject access. It seems to me that Subject Access broadens the name, and gives us a more outward facing name, that has more recognition, would be better understood.

Maja: I agree, it is broader.

Elena: 'Subject access' only means only subject headings in her language.

Maja: 'Subject access' would be the purpose, and C&I are the tools.

Rehab: Maybe Classification & Subject Access?

No.

Harriet: We have a problem when we are not native English-speaking persons. 'Subject Access' cannot be translated into Swedish but I would not translate it into Swedish; because then I would have to explain what we do without using the same words (more words). I'm mostly interested in subject access with metadata from DDC, subject headings, etc.

Tiiu: I am for changing the name. 'Subject access' says what we are providing for others; C&I say what we are doing ourselves.

Janis: I didn't understand originally that C&I had anything to do with subject access. We've got a genre/form index now; is "subject access" the best or might there be an alternative that includes genre/form?

Ekaterina Zaytseva: 'Subject access' is good but only as an addition.

Maja: Let's continue this by email, and then do a poll. Please write your thoughts to the group, including pros and cons and proposals. Then after all the opinions have been heard, we'll do a poll and see.

Elise: Remember to look at the 4 objectives of our group.

Action plan: We'll get a draft ready soon, and it will be distributed by email; please comment and we'll post it.

Remember to get re-nominated if you need to.

See you in Cape Town.