



Minutes

Executive Committee meeting

Tallinn, Estonia, 19-20 October 2007

These Minutes have been approved by the EBLIDA Council.

Chair: Gerald Leitner

Participants: Toby Bainton, Andrew Cranfield, Pernille Drost, Pedro Hípola, Saara Ihamäki, Gerald Leitner, Barbara Lison, Jill Martin, Karin Åstrøm Iko

Not present were Helena Patrício, Carla Sotgiu and Bas Savenije

Friday, 19th October

1. Opening and announcements

Gerald Leitner (GL) opened the Executive Committee meeting and bid everyone welcome.

2. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Bas Savenije

3. Approval of Agenda

The Agenda was approved, but agenda item 5 (Council Min. from Reykjavik) was moved to before item 8 (Main issues of work programme) and item 6.2 (finances and budget) was postponed till Saturday as these had not been received from the accountants at this time.

4. Approval Draft Minutes Executive Committee meetings Reykjavik 10th and 12th May 2007

The minutes from May 10th in Reykjavik were approved. In connection with item 15 concerning the EBLIDA Annual Yearbook the President suggested that the EC should consider cancelling this.

Barbara Lison (BL) commented that it would be nice for EBLIDA to bring out a publication which EBLIDA can use to give to its members and to inform more generally about the work of the organisation. Pernille Drost (PD) agreed with the idea to cancel the yearbook, but supported the proposal for a smaller publication, saying that hopefully it would be possible to incorporate some of the material already produced by EBLIDA. BL suggested that the publication should include some statistical data from the member countries of EBLIDA.



Saara Ihmaki (SI) said that the annual report from the Helsinki Public Library was only available on the internet, but could be printed out in good quality and maybe this should also be the case for EBLIDA.

Jill Martin (JM) thought it should be available in “hard copy” as well, so there was something physical to hand out to members and other stakeholders. She thought we should use a designer for this and aim to produce a professional looking publication.

Toby Bainton (TB) suggested that we might consider sending out the publication with invoices for 2008. Andrew Cranfield (AC) said that the first invoices for 2008 will already be sent out in November of this year, so this would not be possible.

AC noted that there were some funds available for temporary staff which had not been used and that some of these funds could be used for design and publishing costs.

The EC decided that the secretariat would produce the text (with possible input from others) and that the EC would approve the final text by email or at its next meeting. AC said it was important to reuse the logo concept from the website and newsletter. The EC agreed with this, but thought we should play with the design and ensure that the end result is stylish. The publication should be ready for the Annual Council Meeting 2008.

PD will contact a designer in Denmark and get a costing proposal and put the director in touch with the designer.

The minutes from May 12th were also approved with no further comments.

5. EBLIDA internal matters

Announcements

No announcements

Membership

AC gave a short overview of the membership status. All full EBLIDA members have paid their memberships for 2007 and there are 9 associate members outstanding and two sponsors who have not paid for 2007. Reminders have been sent out in September and October. GL explained the policy regarding deletion for the new members of the EC: If members were two years in arrears then they were eligible for deletion at the following year’s Annual Council Meeting.

6. Reports

6.1 Report from the Elevations Conference, Aarhus

The Director reported from this conference in Aarhus held in June regarding user driven innovation and the new social internet platforms – Web 2.0, blogs, etc. The Director had closed the conference with a summation of the two days.

6.2 Report from the kick-off meeting of the EDL-net, The Hague

The director reported from the EDL-net kick-off meeting in September and explained the purpose of this stakeholder forum which brings together associations, organisations and projects from all over Europe. The first priority of the EDL is to produce a portal with 2.000.000 digital objects by 2008 and the role of the EDL-net ranges from content suppliers to others in a more advisory role.

SI asked who are the actual potential users of the EDL – the Director commented that the user group is not limited, but there are bound to be more discussions about this topic and whom the EDL is actually for.

AC mentioned the central and important role of the CENL (Conference of European National Librarians) and that he has been invited to the next CENL board meeting in Oslo on the 18th January 2008. TB commented that the EU Commission is very focused on the CENL in establishing the EDL and they have a pivotal role to play.

6.3 Report from Librarian@2010, Lisbon

Pedro Hípola (PH) reported from the conference saying that there had been approx 15 presentations (selected from over 30 abstracts submitted) and that there had been some good discussions and a strengthening of the relationship with EUCLID. This went some way in helping to bridge the gap between the professional and academic communities.

GL agreed that it had been a good conference, but he thought that the academics had spoken for the academics and the professionals for the professionals. Few presentations had addressed the issues of incorporating academics in practice and vice versa.

PD agreed that there is a need for a discussion regarding the cooperation with EUCLID – what is their agenda and strategy.

The conference had not attracted as many delegates as predicted – BL suggested that maybe it had clashed with an event in another country, while JM thought that it might be a case of bad timing as September is the beginning of the academic year and many are very busy at this time.

Karin Iko Åstrøm (KA) asked whether EUCLID is an important organisation in relation to library associations. GL thought that it was important to have cooperation and contact between the associations and the library schools. KA noted that this division between academia and practice existed in most professions.

PH noted that the abstracts from the conference were available at the website of BAD (The Portuguese Library Association) and AC said that they would also be made available on the EBLIDA website.

PD thought it important to create a “spin off” from the activities that EBLIDA is involved in and use these opportunities to promote the organisation.

PD said that she did not think EUCLID was a strong association that decides policy at the European level. PH agreed saying that it was a small committee and academic organisation and not a lobbying organisation.

The EC decided that EBLIDA should keep in contact with EUCLID, though on a more informal basis.

AC said that there had been a suggestion to hold another EBLIDA-EUCLID conference in 2009 in cooperation with a national library association and a library school. No decision was taken on this proposal at this time.

SI asked whether there had been feedback from the conference, to which AC replied that an evaluation form had been sent out but the data had not been accumulated yet.

6.4 Report from the NAPLE meeting, Madrid

GL and AC gave a report on the NAPLE meeting which focused on digitisation projects within the library sector in Europe. GL referred to a white paper which had been drafted and discussed at last year's NAPLE meeting in Helsinki and which had been sent to the Commission, though the outcome of this communication was unclear. At the NAPLE meeting in Madrid GL stressed the importance of cooperation in initiatives aimed at increasing the role and visibility of libraries in Europe and that it might be a good idea to coordinate this kind of proposal between organisations such as EBLIDA and NAPLE.

AC will distribute the proposed white paper to the members of the EBLIDA EC.

6.5 Report from the Communia Project

On the basis of the written report from Carmen Morlon, AC briefly presented the Communia project and its focus on the value of the public domain in terms of human and economic capital. TB said that it was important to engage politicians in the issues of the public domain in terms of economic access.

The Communia project agreement has to be signed by the involved parties, but there is quite a lot of funding for each project member and this should be used by EBLIDA to strengthen our activities in the field of IPR and open access. The EC decided to sign the agreement and to continue EBLIDA's involvement in the project.

6.6 EBLIDA/LIBER workshop on digitisation, October 2007. Status Report

AC gave a short status report on the coming workshop. At present it looks as though there will be more delegates than first anticipated and that there will be a surplus from the workshop. BS will not attend the workshop, so AC will replace him in closing the conference.

6.7 Report CEG

TB had circulated a brief report on CEG activities over the last 6 months to the EC. The next meeting of the EC will be in Vienna on the 7th – 8th November. TB mentioned some of the issues which had been on the CEG agenda – lobbying against the enforcement directive (IPRED2), the reports from IViR (The institute for international law in Amsterdam), a strategy for the CEG and that the digital libraries' agenda was to be achieved by agreements and

recommendations. AC added that it was important not to forget trade issues and international developments in the work of the CEG.

JM thought it was a good idea for the CEG to be more pro-active, rather than re-active, but PD was slightly worried about where the resources would come from to take a more pro-active approach.

6.8 Report JEGDO (Joint Expert group on Digitisation and Online Access)

AC outlined the time schedule for this group, which would hold a short kick-off meeting in connection with the digitisation workshop in Copenhagen.

BL underlined that this, as is the case for all expert groups, should bring expertise to the EC and EBLIDA and should monitor events in Europe.

There has been some dialogue between EBLIDA and LIBER to establish the JEGDO as a joint expert group. The EC is, in principle, positive towards this idea, but it is essential that an expert group works to fulfil the aims and goals of EBLIDA. For all the members of the EC it was important to remember that public libraries and archives be represented in the EBLIDA expert groups and TB reminded the EC that it is important that a joint expert group reflects the agendas of both organisations. It is essential that this expert group supports digitisation activities in the public library sector as well as the research library sector.

The EC agreed that there should be more experts from the public library sector. PD would approach Aarhus Public Library to enquire if they might be interested in joining the group, while SI would approach someone in Finland.

BL pointed out that many of the topics mentioned in BS's JEGDO paper were of more relevance to the research libraries than the public libraries. BL suggested that there should be some focus on public libraries' access to new media, use of licensed material outside of the library (it was decided to contact Jan Braeckman from the VCOB for possible participation in the expert group). JM thought it was also important to focus on local collections and local history collections as an area where public libraries have some expertise and experience.

PH outlined the importance of the Commissions' recommendation on digitisation and online access, but AC saw this as primarily being a document aimed at and for the National and University libraries. SI and BL thought it important to focus on accessibility and the end user, rather than just the building up of collections.

There followed more discussion on the joint expert group and the EC approved a trial period of two years (as suggested by BL) after which there would be an evaluation of the JEGDO.

6.9 Report from the WG on Professional Education

JM presented the report, based on the results of the meeting held in London (present at this meeting were PH, JM, AC and Marion Huckle). The WG recommended that an expert group be established to monitor and follow European developments of interest to the LIS and archive sector, but it was important to remember to stay focused on "our profession" and not stray into other areas of education in general.

BL thought that this was an excellent paper and a good start to following up on the European agenda.

JM underlined that the group should focus on curriculum delivery, rather than curriculum content, though naturally one cannot totally separate one from the other.

GL thought it was important for EBLIDA to formulate a position on whether it was in the interests of the LIS sector in Europe to work for a common curriculum and he underlined that this is an area which the expert group should address and thereby help formulate EBLIDA's policy in this field.

PD thought it was important for the expert group to know the position of the EC, while BL said that this was a "chicken or egg issue" – the expert group, if established, must formulate its strategic intentions and then these will be discussed at the next meeting of the EC. KA supported the proposal for the establishment of this expert group, but wanted the archives to be represented as well (ICA has an expert group in this field) and perhaps there can be ICA representation in this group. KA will follow up on this.

GL instigated a discussion on possible names for the expert group. Both BL and PD have suggestions and they will follow up on this and report back to the director. PH said he thought it important that the group did not have too many researchers/professionals, but needed a good representation from the profession. The EC was strongly in favour of this, BL adding that it would be excellent to include a practitioner who practices professional development in the workplace. GL was also in favour of representation from the new member states.

The EC agreed to the establishment of an expert group on professional education. The members of the WG will follow up on suggestions for persons for the group and define scope, aims, goals, and the name of the group and submit a more detailed strategy to the EC in time for its meeting at the end of February.

6.10 Report from the WG on Culture

BL added some reflections to the notes produced from the last EC meeting in Iceland. There is a need for EBLIDA to speak in the area of culture at the European level. However, there is perhaps a need for a broader scope for this group and maybe these issues should be addressed by two separate working groups – one for culture and information society and one for lifelong learning and education.

PD supported the suggestion for two separate groups and KA was also positive, adding that her own institution, the DIK in Sweden, works a lot in the area of cultural policy. GL said that he thought there may come a new agenda for culture from the Commission. So it is essential for EBLIDA to bring questions of culture and libraries to the forefront and lobby for the promotion of culture at the European level.

It is important to ensure participation from the archives in the expert groups on education and LLL and culture and information society.

The EC discussed various names for the expert groups and the EC approved the establishment of an expert group on culture and information society (to be chaired by BL) and an expert group on education and lifelong learning (to be chaired by PD). TB thought this had been a

very clear and fruitful discussion and raised a number of important political issues that EBLIDA should focus on in the future. It was decided that the Chairs of the expert groups would meet with the President and the Director in Copenhagen on 13th December at the offices of the Danish Union of Librarians (BF).

7. Finances and budget 2007 (postponed from Friday)

The director presented the report from the accountants, which had only arrived the same day (the first report was based on the original 2007 budget and not the revised budget). The report offered no notes or explanations as to the figures and it was therefore impossible to assess the economic status of EBLIDA. The EC expressed its dissatisfaction with the situation and the director promised to relay this to the accountants, arrange a new meeting and establish guidelines for the future working relationship. Once the treasurer and director have held a new meeting, the director will report back to the EC with a more detailed financial summary.

8. Council minutes from Reykjavik. Discussion of comments and suggestions from the group discussions (postponed from Friday)

GL suggested that at the next EC meeting at the end of February 2008 the EC should discuss the issues of membership etc. The director will prepare a paper outlining earlier discussions in EC and Council meetings on this subject in order that the present EC has a clear overview of prior discussions in this area.

Other issues from the Council minutes were discussed and taken on board, though it was not felt that there should be changes to the strategy document itself, but that these comments should be seen as more general reflections to take into account in the future. On the subject of lobbying at the national level, GL pointed out that we should perhaps use the conferences we arrange and/or attend for promoting the activities of EBLIDA.

The EC and director agreed that the Council minutes should be ready for approval no later than one month after the Council Meeting. BL also underlined that there are rules governing the distribution of papers prior to EC meetings and that these should be adhered to.

9. Discussion of main issues of work programme 2007-2009

9.1 Membership and membership campaign

GL underlined the importance of obtaining full members from all the EU member states and there have been some good contacts to some library associations over the last few months. It was decided that EBLIDA would offer membership to library associations from EU member states where there is no representation for 200 EURO for year 1 and the associate member rate for year 2 and 3 and thereafter as full members based on the AMP figures.

It was decided to wait till the next EC meeting and a more detailed discussion of an associate member campaign and align this with a more general discussion of membership rights.

9.2 Expert and working groups

The EC approved the final version of the regulations for working and expert groups. At the suggestion of the director the EC decided that each expert group would appoint a secretary and information coordinator to help facilitate the work of the expert groups.

9.3 EBLIDA Knowledge Centre

GL outlined his thoughts for a European Knowledge Centre and the possibility of collecting and disseminating relevant and strategic information about the library and information sector in Europe. He hoped that it would be possible for EBLIDA to secure EU funding for this project. GL thought that a model building, to some extent, on InfoNet Europe (<http://www.infonet-ae.net/>) would be ideal and build a forum for communication and participation. AC has a contact at the Commission who he will approach in order to arrange a meeting in Brussels to discuss the project. GL and AC will attempt to set up a meeting with representatives from InfoNet Europe and at the meeting on the 13th of December in Copenhagen those present will discuss the role of the expert groups within the framework of the knowledge centre. PH thought it important that the knowledge centre reflect what is on the EU agenda for libraries and the information society.

The knowledge centre is a main strategic aim for EBLIDA and must be established even if EU funding cannot be ensured, though the resources available for this will then be based on the capacity of the secretariat.

GL and AC had discussed the relationship and cooperation with other organisations in relation to the knowledge centre and recommended that EBLIDA creates the basis and concept for the knowledge centre and then investigate the possibility of inviting and incorporating other interested parties and stakeholders to join the knowledge centre.

9.4 Conferences

The EC recommends that EBLIDA should aim to hold at least one conference pr. year (possibly in conjunction with another organisation) as well as the Annual Council meeting.

10. Programme for EBLIDA Council Meeting May 2008

GL and AC reported from their meeting with Marion Koren about next years joint EBLIDA/VOB/FOBID and the programme. The EC approved the programme and the choice of venues (Haag/Amsterdam). PD underlined the importance of ensuring a good marketing strategy for this annual meeting and the EC agreed that EBLIDA would start the promotion of the annual council meeting already this year. The programme on Thursday 8th of May 2008 (the annual meeting itself) will be without charge for EBLIDA members, while the second part of the meeting to be held in Amsterdam will cost 50-60 EURO pr. delegate.

11. Council Meeting 2009

GL invited EBLIDA to Vienna to host its annual meeting in 2009 under the title “Legalise it” – Libraries: access for all.

12. Next EC Meeting

The next meeting will be held from 29th February till March 1st 2008 in Bordeaux. AC will liaise with BL on contacts etc.

Provisional dates for the autumn 2008 EC meeting are 10th – 11th October. Venue to be decided upon.

13. AOB

BL mentioned the Anna Lind Foundation and it might be worth it for EBLIDA to investigate funding from here. KA will investigate.

At the suggestion of TB and AC the EC approved two new members for the CEG who will attend the next meeting of the CEG in Vienna in November.

14. Closure of meeting

GL thanked everyone for their excellent contributions and closed the meeting.