Business Meeting no. 1

Date: Thursday, 24 August 2017
Time: 08:00-08:45
Venue: IASE 1/51

Minutes

1.0 Opening

1.1 Welcome Remarks
Lars Svensson greeted everyone to these two meetings with the LIDATEC Subcommittee. It was noted that the meeting of the incoming LIDATEC would be held as soon as the first meeting was over instead of waiting until 10:45.

1.2 Appointment of minute-taker
Anders Cato, incoming chair was elected minute-taker of the meeting.

1.3 Introduction and Apologies

Present LIDATEC:
  Lars Svensson (Chair)
  Gordon Dunsire
  Mirna Willer
  Rehab Ouf (liaison to CoS)

Apologies LIDATEC:
  Uldis Bojars

Not present LIDATEC:
  Shawky Salem

IFLA Secretariat:
  Joanne Yeomans

Observers:
  Anders Cato
  Marja-Liisa Seppälä
  Jenny Wright
  Chris Oliver
1.4 Approval of the Agenda
The agenda was approved.

2.0 Approval of minutes

2.1 Business meeting 2015 (Cape Town)
There were no formal meetings from Cape Town. Joanne made informal notes and distributed them to the list after the meeting. It was pointed out that we can’t formally accept these notes as minutes. The meeting decided to have them published as informal meeting notes instead.

ACTION: Joanne to publish her notes as on the LIDATEC web page with a note that they are not formal minutes but informal notes.

2.2 Business meeting 2016 (Columbus)
The chair could regrettfully not attend the meeting in Columbus. The minutes were taken by Abraham and were circulated afterwards. They were accepted by the meeting as correct and will be published.

ACTION: Joanne to publish the minutes from the Columbus meeting on the LIDATEC web page as official minutes.

2.3 Matters Arising from the Minutes

2.3.1 Change of names of LIDASIG – approved.
2.3.2 *Encourage Committee on Standards to change the license* – approved. However it was stressed that there is still no visible evidence of this. The meeting’s suggestion to the Committee on Standards: The license of the IFLA Namespaces and all other IFLA standards should be visible on the Committee’s page. IFLA should be mentioning what is part of its strategy and that we use an open license to get as large adoption as possible and explicitly encourage commercial re-use. Joanne stressed that we just need to decide where to put that statement, we don’t need to consult the Committee on Standards.

**ACTION:** We will consult the new LIDATEC subcommittee and the Committee on Standards on where to put the statement.

2.3.3 *Use of OMR.*

The Committee on Standards made a proposal to the Governing Board to upgrade to a newer version of the OMR. The reply from the Governing Board was that they agree in principal, but would like to investigate whether there is wider support among IFLA Members and if so, whether there is any potential for direct financial support. Joanne clarified:

Headquarters were asked to investigate further into support and direct sponsorship for this together with National Library and Academic Library Members. A plan for how they will be contacted will be made on return to the office after the Congress. Several National Libraries have said that this is essential, but are they willing to contribute to funding? However the sum needed is considerably small if you divide it on all contributors, so the Governing Board is fairly hopeful to find funding within the near future.

Gordon pointed out that IFLA Namespaces was registered 6 years ago, We need a clarification of the situation now. It can’t go on like this any further.

Joanne replied that the Governing Board wants to take a decision in December this year and she is very confident that this will be the case. She stressed that LIDATEC then needs to help the Governing Board with the contract and its contents, so once funding is there the contribution of this subcommittee will be crucial.

**ACTION:** the Bibliographic standards groups should prepare their namespaces to have them ready to be entered into the OMR, so we can proceed immediately once a decision has been taken.
2.3.4 Analysis for namespaces.
A question was posed as to whether the OMR is good enough or not. The meeting concluded that the answer is Yes.

2.3.5 Manual for IFLA standards as namespaces.
There has been no work done on that in the last few years. Gordon reported that there is a document, but it is 3-4 years old and should be updated before being sent around.

**ACTION**: Gordon agreed to update the document and send it out.

2.3.6 Collaboration with LIDASIG and other groups
There has been no real action up until now.

**ACTION**: The incoming LIDATEC take new contact with LIDASIG and the bibliographic standards review groups etc. to establish formal liaisons.

3.0 Reports and Information

3.1 LIDATEC Chair
Most important part of the chair’s work has been preparing a paper for the Governing Board on the use of IFLA Namespaces. That paper has already been discussed earlier at this meeting, c.f. 2.3.3.

The “Guidelines for Translation of IFLA Namespaces in RDF” were approved by the Professional Committee on the 18th of August.

Massimo voiced a small concern that the published version of the guidelines would not be the same as the approved one. Joanne guaranteed that nothing would be changed in the document.

3.2 IFLA Secretariat
There was no further reports.

3.3 Other reports and briefing
Nothing to report.

4.0 Action Plan – Discussions and adoption
4.1 **Update on actions performed since August 2016**

Abraham had circulated a draft action plan on October 11, 2016. Since there had been no formal decision to adopt the action plan, there were no actions to update on.

The incoming committee will create an action plan for 2017-2018. Namespaces will be the most important issue and the document manual issue. It is also of importance to work closely with ISBD Linked Data SG.

A question arose as to the possibility of having measure usage. How much traffic do we get on our servers? How many institutions use our namespaces and how do we increase usage? One source of information regarding usage of IFLA NS is LODStats (http://stats.lod2.eu/).

We must maintain links with other Linked Open Data organisations.

Other liaisons with external bodies were discussed.

Lars has already mentioned the collaboration with W3C regarding standardisation of ePub at the Committee on Standards meeting as one possible liaison.

Gordon has registered our namespaces with Linked Open Vocabularies. He has also done so for another European portal (JOINUP). For the future work LIDATEC should renew this. If the European site dies, we should remove our namespaces from there.

4.2 **Proposals for new action items to be introduced**

See second meeting.

5.0 **Collaboration with LIDASIG and Other Groups**

5.1 **LIDASIG**

LIDASIG (Linked Data Special Interest Group) is sponsored by the IT section in order to promote outreach of linked data to libraries and have an open discussion on questions that libraries have and feedback suggestions for possible solutions. Yesterday there was a proposal that the two should be a joint organisation, but Lars opposes such a solution. The scope of the two groups is completely different, the technical group is highly technical, and the SIG is more down-to-earth. The meeting agreed with Lars.

It was stressed that all meetings are open meetings and we should therefore
instead encourage visiting each other’s meetings.

Massimo pointed out that the LIDATEC meetings must be on the IFLA WLIC programme which they were not this year.

**ACTION**: Joanne to ensure that the meetings are in the congress programme in the future.

### 6.0 Any Other Business

No other business.

### 7.0 Adjournment