

EURIG Annual Members' Meeting

September 19-20, 2013

National Library of Sweden, Stockholm



MINUTES (final version)

Contents

Thursday September 19th	2
Welcome and introductions	2
Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising	2
Membership update / Survey results.....	2
Reports of working groups: Music WG	2
Reports of working groups: Aggregates WG	3
Discussion of JSC proposals / EURIG responses: Session 1, Aggregate works.....	3
6JSC/ACOC/07 Compiler and editors of compilations	3
6JSC/ALA/Discussion/1 Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA.....	3
6JSC/ALA/26 Colour content	4
6JSC/ACOC/8 Addition of the Copyright holder relationship.....	4
Discussion of JSC proposals / EURIG responses: Session 2, Internationalization	5
6JSC/DNB/Discussion/1 First issue v. latest (current) issue	5
6JSC/LC/25 Recording dates in more than one calendar	5
6JSC/DNB/1 Parts of the Bible: Books (RDA 6.23.2.9.2)	5
6JSC/ALA/23 Revision proposal for RDA instructions for treaties.....	6
DBC proposal relationship designators in RDA	6
6JSC/CCC/11 Revision of RDA 2.3.1.7 (Titles of Parts, Sections, and Supplements) and RDA 2.3.2.6 (Collective Title and Titles of Individual Contents).....	6
6JSC/CCC/12 Revision of Appendix D regarding capitalization practice	6
Election of the committee	7
EURIG activity plan	7
Future EURIG meetings.....	7
Announcements, etc.....	7
Friday September 20th	7
Subjects in RDA	8
Roundtable discussion	8
Closing.....	12
Appendix 1: Attendees	12
Appendix 2: Music WG report	13
Appendix 3: Action points	13

The meeting was chaired by Alan Danskin, British Library.

Thursday September 19th

Welcome and introductions

Miriam Säfström (National Library of Sweden) and Alan Danskin (British Library) welcomed the participating EURIG representatives.

Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted with a thank you to Laura. The action points from the previous meeting were to be discussed later.

There were a few additions to the agenda:

- Discussion of JSC proposals / EURIG responses, session 2 "Internationalization"
 - Rita Albrecht (Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Verbundsysteme, Germany) would like to discuss [CCC/12 Revision of Appendix D regarding capitalization practice](#)
 - Verena Schaffner (Austrian Library Network) would like to discuss [CCC/11 Revision of RDA 2.3.1.7 \(Titles of Parts, Sections, and Supplements\) and RDA 2.3.2.6 \(Collective Title and Titles of Individual Contents\)](#)
 - The DBC proposal on relationship designators in RDA, which was sent to the EURIG members on 12 September 2013, will also be discussed
- Françoise Leresche (BnF) would like to discuss music.

Membership update / Survey results

EURIG currently has 31 members. We welcomed the National and University Library of Iceland, represented by Ragna Steinarsdóttir, as the most recent new member.¹

The membership survey is still open till the end of September 2013. So far 15 members (i.e. 50%) have responded. Alan presented the interim results, which show that four more members have taken a decision to implement, making 8 so far.

Reasons for not implementing RDA are: no translation available in their national language, fear of cost, desire to know more about the impact on current practices.

Reasons given for implementing RDA are: interoperability, FRBR, need to replace their current cataloguing code. Few mention cost effectiveness as a reason to implement.

Gildas Illien (BnF) mentioned that he was invited to write a paper for LIBER on cataloguing in Europe (for publication in 2014), and that he would like to use the results from the members' survey. It was then agreed that they should provide the basis of the LIBER paper.

Nina Berve (National Library of Norway) asked whether you should respond on behalf of your country or on behalf of your institution. Answers to the survey should be given on behalf of your institution. If your institution represents the entire country, indicate so in a comment.

Reports of working groups: Music WG

Christine Frodl (DNB) has initiated a EURIG focus group for representing the European viewpoint on music (both classical and popular). Four people have been nominated for the group, but there is no chair, and the group is not yet active. Christine Frodl (DNB) has sent the names of the group members to the JSC, who suggested to work with the IAML cataloguing group.

¹ It later became clear that the current membership number is 32. The Danish Bibliographic Centre became a member shortly after the 2012 Annual Meeting in Madrid.

There was some debate whether there is a need for the working group, but it seemed more a management problem than a lack of need. In the end it was agreed that Anders Cato (who happened to be present) will take the action forward and speak with Joseph Hafner (Cataloguing Commission of IAML). The committee will prepare terms of reference for the WG.

Christine Frodl's (written) report is included in [Appendix 2](#).

Reports of working groups: Aggregates WG

Miriam Säfström and Françoise Leresche reported on the Aggregates working group. The group met in Paris in March. Most contributions to the group came from the BnF. Topics discussed were illustrations, augmentations and compilations. The group worked on examples and tests. A proposal was sent to the JSC after review by Alan and the EURIG members.

Alan thanked the group for the lot of work and the refreshing input for the JSC.

Discussion of JSC proposals / EURIG responses: Session 1, Aggregate works

Four papers related to aggregate works were discussed.

6JSC/ACOC/07 Compiler and editors of compilations

The proposed addition of a new paragraph at 20.2.1.1 Scope and the suggestion to amend 20.2.1.3 Recording Contributors to exclude the term Compiler raised much discussion. The current definition of compiler excludes those who aggregate existing works. Is this correct? Alan Danskin also queried the value of making a distinction between editor and editor of compilation. What is the benefit of this distinction to the end user? There were different views on this, and the topic is difficult to pin down. Furthermore, in certain languages (such as Danish and German) the distinction between certain roles does not exist. Therefore they would like the possibility of making no distinction at all between those roles.

EURIG agrees with the intention of clarifying the instructions regarding compilers and editors of compilations, and proposes to redefine "Editor of Compilation" to "Creator of Compilation", but there would be no objection to merge "Creator of Compilation" with "Compiler".

6JSC/ALA/Discussion/1 Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA

This discussion paper is a follow up to [6JSC/ALA/17](#). It contains the following recommendations:

1. Add Extent of Expression to the RDA element set
2. Add Extent of Item to the RDA element set, to parallel Extent of Manifestation and the proposed Extent of Expression
3. Extend the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization, in order to flesh out fuller sets of types for content and carrier
4. Modify the Aspect-Unit-Quantity (AUQ) model to accommodate complex extent data

Regarding 1) EURIG thinks it a good thing to add an element "Extent of Expression". There is no consensus whether it should be core or not, though there certainly is a favor for core. EURIG also thinks that it makes sense to base the values for the element upon the RDA vocabulary for Content Type, but feels the need to refine the vocabulary to find more user friendly terms.

Regarding 2) There was discussion whether it is necessary to add Extent of Item, but several members noted that it was important in an international standardized context,

that we need consistency for the machine also, and that it makes sense from the model perspective. There was consensus among EURIG members that it is useful to have this machine-actionable data in the context of digitisation, but that the need is less clear in the context of identification of rare books.

Regarding 3) EURIG agrees to refinement, allowing for more user friendly terms (though making the terms more user friendly is not a goal per se). According to EURIG, there is no need to charge a separate group to develop draft category tables, vocabulary values, and label construction patterns for RDA categorization terms.

Regarding 4) EURIG agrees to the recommendation of the AUQ model to make the information more machine actionable. It was noted that we do not have any exchange format to share this data, but Alan stated that this could lead to changes in format.

6JSC/ALA/26 Colour content

Nine recommendations from this paper were discussed at the meeting:

- 1 Vocabulary vs. instructions
- 2 Single Vocabulary for colour content of all resources
- 3 Define "colour"
- 5 Grey scale should be used only for digital resources
- 6 Tinted and Toned: production method or colour content?
- 7 Sepia (retained)
- 8 Order of elements (none)
- 9 Expand 7.17.5.3 to cover non-textual resources
- 10 Hand colouring (restricted to item)

EURIG agreed without discussion to recommendations 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The other recommendations were discussed.

Regarding recommendation 1 "Vocabulary vs. instructions" there was no consensus which option should be preferred. Option 1 seemed better for cataloguers, but some members preferred option 2.

The EURIG discussions regarding recommendation 3 "Define "colour" reflected the discussions held at ALA. In the end EURIG disagreed with the proposed definition, but could not come up with a better one.

Regarding recommendation 10 "Hand colouring (restricted to item)" EURIG thinks that hand colouring might in specific cases belong to the manifestation level. Switzerland and the BnF can provide examples of this.

Action: BNF & Swiss National Library

6JSC/ACOC/8 Addition of the Copyright holder relationship

This proposal contains the following amendments to RDA 21.6.1.1 and Appendix I:

- Add copyright holders to scope of Other person, family or corporate body associated with the manifestation.
- Add relationship designator for "copyright holder: A person, family, or corporate body that holds a legal right to a manifestation under copyright or similar laws."

There was discussion whether the information about the copyright holder should be on the expression level instead of the manifestation level. Also the terminology was under debate: some members preferred "holder of the intellectual property right" to "copyright holder". There was a general feeling that information regarding intellectual property right belongs to the expression level, but that, especially in Germany, there seems to be a need to relate this information on the manifestation level. The conclusion was that the terminology should be reconsidered, and that more and clearer use cases were needed. Gildas also noted that there are different use cases for end users and for library management.

EURIG agreed that the responses for any of these proposals / discussions should be integrated into the responses by the British Library. The EURIG responses should be clearly identifiable as EURIG's.

Discussion of JSC proposals / EURIG responses:

Session 2, Internationalization

The afternoon session started with the discussion of selected JSC proposals / discussions on topics that are relevant in the context of internationalization. Seven proposals were discussed during this session.

6JSC/DNB/Discussion/1 First issue v. latest (current) issue

Christine Frodl (DNB) introduced the discussion paper. The first issue approach in RDA raised much discussion in the German cataloguing community, where descriptions are based on the most recent issue, and earlier information is presented in indexes and machine readable notes. The JSC asked the German cataloguing community to provide a discussion paper on this topic, also because there are different approaches in RDA between continuing resources (first issue approach) and integrated resources (latest issue approach). The discussion paper proposes an interim / low impact solution, as well as a longer term approach to work towards.

EURIG agreed that in records it should be explicitly stated which practice (first issue of latest issue approach) is followed. EURIG also proposes to discuss with ALA Publishing whether it will be possible to show users of RDA only the set of rules of the practice they are following, so that they may avoid the rules that are not applicable to the approach they have chosen.²

EURIG acknowledges that legacy data is a problem for everyone, whichever approach you choose. OCLC pointed out that they see the same tendency for e-books: they are also a kind of integrating resources, and end users are generally interested in the latest version of the e-book. The BnF stated that France won't change to latest issue cataloguing for reasons of economy. They cannot guarantee that they will be able to update the records.

EURIG feels that the addition of alternative instructions to RDA is a practical interim solution, but is not happy with it in the longer term. There was concern about the sustainability of the alternative instructions. In the end a three point plan was developed: 1) define metadata to specify whether an element is current, intermediate or superseded; 2) define element to specify the source (e.g. first issue, last issue); 3) generalise instructions so that RDA is neutral on first/last issue.

6JSC/LC/25 Recording dates in more than one calendar

EURIG agrees that, in the context of internationalization, it is good not to focus exclusively on the Gregorian/Julian calendar.

6JSC/DNB/1 Parts of the Bible: Books (RDA 6.23.2.9.2)

The DNB had proposed to use a more general text instead of "Authorized version (i.e. King James)". EURIG agrees to this, and also to omit the text "If the preferred language of the agency creating the data is English, use the brief citation form of the Authorized Version". OCLC pointed out that, even if your language of cataloguing is English, that does not necessarily mean that your preferred names used as access points also should be in English.

² Note that this is moot (and no further action is required), as JSC decided not to introduce alternative instructions.

6JSC/ALA/23 Revision proposal for RDA instructions for treaties

Four recommendations from the revised proposal were discussed at the EURIG meeting:

- Record the title of the treaty as the preferred title for all treaties, and use the title of the treaty as the basis for the authorized access point.
- Create a generic definition of treaty for the Glossary and using that term in the RDA text to signify all kinds of treaties and international agreements.
- Broaden the definition of RDA 6.20.3 (Date of Signing of a Treaty, Etc.) to include the date of adoption, and simplify the punctuation to always use parentheses.
- Minor changes to examples and other instructions

EURIG agrees to these recommendations, and proposes that signatories should be expressed as a relationship (instead of an element).

DBC proposal relationship designators in RDA

EURIG agrees to the addition of the following relationship designators:

- Needlework designer (as a refinement under "artist")
- Creator of recipe (as a refinement under "author")
- Keeper of the minutes (as a refinement under "contributor")

There was no consensus about the addition of:

- Responsible corporate body (as a refinement under "Other ... corporate body associated with the work")
- Reader (as a refinement under „Performer“)

The National Library of Finland and the DNB (Germany) found "responsible corporate body" not specific enough. It appeared that the need for the addition of "reader" was not applicable to all languages. In some languages there is a specific term of the reader of an audiobook, while in other languages a more general term is used (such as "speaker").

EURIG agreed that for the designators "Responsible corporate body" and "Reader" more examples and discussion are needed. This can be done via e-mail.

Action: ALL

There was also discussion about the implementation of male/female designators. There was consensus that gender is an attribute of the person, and that you should not bring this into the terms/concepts for the relationships. The problem is that certain terms include the aspect of gender, and that a gender neutral equivalent is not always available (like uncle/aunt vs. grand parent, for grandfather and grandmother).

6JSC/CCC/11 Revision of RDA 2.3.1.7 (Titles of Parts, Sections, and Supplements) and RDA 2.3.2.6 (Collective Title and Titles of Individual Contents)

Verena Schaffner (Austrian Library Network) introduced this proposal. There are questions regarding the part titles: are they separated by a full stop (when no separate records are created)? It appears that some examples in RDA use ISBD punctuation, which is strange. EURIG would like to ask JSC to look into this.

Action: Alan Danskin

Françoise Leresche (BNF, France) stated that a multipart item is not the same as a compilation of works, and that both should have examples of comprehensive description and analytical description.

6JSC/CCC/12 Revision of Appendix D regarding capitalization practice

EURIG supports the revision of Appendix D.

Election of the committee

There was only one nomination, so no need for voting.

- Verena Schaffner (Austrian Library Network) was elected Chair.
- Alan Danskin (British Library) completed his term as Chair and was elected Vice Chair.
- Lian Wintermans (National Library of the Netherlands) will continue as Secretary until Laura Peters' return from maternity leave.
- Gildas Illien (BNF) completed his term as Vice Chair.

EURIG activity plan

We did most of our previous action plan. The members' survey (planned for February 2013) is not yet completed.

Next year's action plan also depends on the outcomes of the JSC feedback to the discussion papers and on future proposals.

The BnF (France) states that they won't undertake new tasks for EURIG next year, they will focus on the topics already carried out.

The Music Working Group need to detect proposals that affect music.

We expect the timescale of JSC meetings to be similar to this year.

Next year the IFLA conference takes place in Lyon, France. If needed EURIG members or working groups could meet then.

We need to review the list of topics from the EURIG meeting in Frankfurt.

Action: Committee

Gildas Illien (BnF, France) asked for an overview of what we wanted to accomplish, where we stand now and what we still need to do. This will especially be helpful for managers, and it could also be useful for those still thinking about adopting RDA.

Future EURIG meetings

When asked (in the 2013 survey) whether an additional meeting was needed, 5 members responded "yes", 10 members "no". There is some interest in meetings on specific topics in conjunction with other events.

A lot of members are interested in hosting a future EURIG meeting.

Next year's meeting was initially planned at the National Library of Switzerland, but all concerned agreed today that it would be Vienna. The 2015 meeting will be in Bern, Switzerland.

The date of the next meeting depends on the JSC schedule.

Action: Committee to propose date when JSC schedule is known

Announcements, etc.

The IFLA Cataloguing section organises a satellite meeting on RDA on Wednesday August 13, 2014 in Frankfurt. On August 14, 2014 there will be an IFLA satellite meeting in Paris on the semantic web ("make it happen"). Two tracks are planned: one plenary session, and one with a workshop (which aims at librarians, technicians, managers).

The French translation of RDA (by the French and Canadians) is completed and is available online in the RDA Toolkit, and in print. The translation will be updated by Canada (until France will have implemented RDA).

Friday September 20th

Two items were on the agenda for today: subjects in RDA, and a roundtable discussion on bibliographic transition issues.

Subjects in RDA

FRBR Group 3 entities are currently represented by placeholder chapters in RDA. This is no satisfactory for a comprehensive resource description standard, but RDA should not) prescribe in detail how to handle subjects in cataloguing. Two papers on the subject of subjects in RDA were discussed this morning:

- [6JSC/Chair/8 Proposals for Subject Relationships](#)
- [6JSC/ALA/Discussion/2 Treatment of Subjects in RDA](#)

Alan Danskin introduced the papers by giving some background information and summarizing the choices regarding subjects in RDA.

There was a slight majority for the ALA proposal.

Arguments mentioned in favour of the ALA proposal were:

- The FRBR Review Group is looking how to incorporate the FRBR and the FRSAD models
- You are free to choose your own subject system (provided it meets the FRSAD model)
- We already use "place" outside the context of subjects, this will certainly also with "events"
- FRSAD is simple and removes some complications that came into FRBR with the "concept", "object" and "event" entities
- The ALA model is more open and flexible: we expect that all subject systems can be used with the ALA model, but not with the current FRBR model

Arguments mentioned in favour of the Chair proposal were:

- The paper covers classification schemes better

Adoption of the FRSAD model (the ALA proposal) will cause a lot of restructuring. The expectation is that it may take 2-3 years to incorporate this into RDA.

There was no consensus concerning the ALA proposal to change the terms *Thema / Nomen* to *Name / Name of Subject*. Some found the proposed names clearer for cataloguers, while others preferred the more abstract original terms.

EURIG agreed to the following:

- The introduction of the "has subject/is subject of" relationship to RDA
- If the FRSAD model were to be adopted, the *Nomen* should be an attribute of *Thema*, as this is consistent with the RDA model

The EURIG chair will soon after the meeting provide a list/overview of the outcomes of the meeting (to be put on the EURIG web site).

Action: Alan Danskin

Roundtable discussion

The remaining part of the morning was devoted to a roundtable discussion of current developments in open data e.g. licensing matters around metadata), linked data (such as persistent identifiers, ontologies and vocabularies), FRBR-ization, ISNI (International Standard Name Identifier) and electronic media.

The **British Library** has been opening data for 3 years (predominantly bibliographic data). They offer the following services:

- MARC data (but they charge for the data)
- Free Z39.50 service (not a bulk service) which is quite popular and successful - Important, because they can show management and government that people use their data

- Linked data service (CC-0 license), consisting of the national bibliography

The BL is looking to expand the linked data service in several formats (e.g. triples, json), but also simplified CSV, because people ask for it.

One of the difficulties with the linked data service is to find out who uses it. Also you want them to receive updates through you instead third parties.

The **National Library of Sweden** has been working with open data and linked data for some time. They started to make data available in 2007, by just publishing the data (since there was not yet much to link to). Like the British Library they find it difficult to know the users of the data.

In 2011 they made the entire national bibliography and authority files available as linked open data. They want to make everything available under a CC-0 license, and are now clearing the metadata.

The vision of openness is now retrospectively applied to the (marketing of the) physical library, for example regarding opening hours.

In **Switzerland** the government also promotes open data, and launched a pilot portal in September 2013: <http://opendata.admin.ch/en>.

SNL is contributing with four selected data sets: Bibliography on Swiss History, Swiss Book (national bibliography), electronic dissertations and digitized objects. The datasets are classed in the category 'Education and Science' and may be downloaded in the marc-xml format. All data are available under a CC0 licence. It is open data, but not linked data.

The **German National Library (DNB)** started to publish authority data as linked data in 2010. Most of the bibliographic data was added in January 2012. The license used is CC-0. The data is available in RDF/XML. More information can be found at <http://www.dnb.de/EN/lds>.

The **Austrian Library Network** has not yet decided to publish open data in CC-0, but is working on that. However, they do use linked data from others (such as DBpedia) and are also involved in linked data groups. The Austrian government works on openness and open data, but they cannot yet say how and when their bibliographic data will be available as (linked) open data.

All member networks of the **German "Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Verbundsysteme"** provide open data or linked open data under a CC-0 license. Most of them are available in RDF triples. Delegates of the German networks work together with the German National Library in an ontology group to harmonize the creation of linked open data (so far every institution is using its own ontology).

One of the German library networks - HeBIS - is also reusing the open data service of the BL bibliography (BNB). The RDF/XML is converted to the HeBIS-PICA format and imported to the network's database. There it is used for acquisitions (information profiles on new titles) and cataloguing (re-use).

The **Bavarian State Library (Germany)** has opened its triple store, under CC-0 license. The RDF/XML data pool was published in 2010, updated only twice a year, 23 million records, more than 600 million RDF-triples. The LOD is used for example in the TEL portal, but they do not have any information about the reuse of their RDF/XML data. They also provide MARC21 records (you can download the catalogue) and have an OAI-PMH data pool.

The **Austrian Library Network** plans a survey to find out if institutions/organisations that have opened their data know what has happened to it: Did someone use the data in applications? etc. It is clear that people will open their data when they know who will be using their data. Verena will share the survey and also the results of the survey with the EURIG members.

The **National Library of Spain** had a project to FRBR-ize the catalogue. They made a tool for FRBR-ization (Marimba) in cooperation with the University of Madrid (who developed the tool). The tool is not a commercial product, and one of the things to do is adding a user friendly interface.

In one case they know who used their open data.

The British Library and the Austrian Library Network also have projects for FRBR-izing their data, and they asked whether the National Library of Spain could share their FRBR-ization algorithms.

The **National Library of Finland** is planning a new library system, based on the RDA/FRBR model. It is an open system and it will take some years before it is ready.

The **Danish Bibliographic Centre** has published the national bibliography as linked open data, but they do not know who uses it. The union catalogue is a service where the data is FRBR-ized for the end users. The linked data is not FRBR-ized. The DBC presented a paper on linked data at the IFLA conference last August.

In the **Netherlands** the shared cataloguing system GGC is part of **OCLC**, therefore they use the CC-by license for the metadata instead of CC-0. We think the data will ultimately be free, but it is not free of costs and we want to be in control of the data. The Dutch name authority file (NTA) is now in VIAF and so we are also participating in ISNI.

The decision to adopt RDA was made in February, and we will start having RDA compliant records in the shared cataloguing system from November 2013 onwards.

OCLC also started a project on work records with the public libraries. It turned out that they wanted to see the expression level, not the work level. They wanted, for example, to see publications in their own languages (instead of the language of the original work).

They will start using work records for fiction. The academic libraries are not much interested (except for digitized works, perhaps). The creation of work records (only when needed; at least in the national bibliography) will be integrated in the cataloguing workflow.

It is not yet clear how this will fit in the BIBFRAME model/schema. Alan noted that the BIBFRAME model is work in progress, and that recently there has been much discussion regarding holdings. The idea is to provide a lightweight model, but in practice it is difficult not to put everything from MARC or RDA into it.

The **British Library** uses PRIMO for resource discovery. PRIMO has a FRBRization algorithm, which is applied to selected "pipes" to cluster manifestations of a work. The results are dependent on the quality and consistency of the metadata FRBR concepts are also being explored in the redevelopment of the Library's Website.

The **National Library of Latvia** published in August their authority data in VIAF. They converted it to RDF for reuse in their own catalogue, but it is not yet open to the public. They are thinking about opening up their bibliographic data, but are not sure who will use it.

At the **National Library of France (BnF)** management cuts a lot of cataloguing jobs, they need to do more with less staff. On the other hand metadata has to be useful, and they need use cases for it.

They are trying to build the bricks at fundamental levels (both legal and conceptual). They published their data in RDF (CC-by license). Their linked data service includes bibliographic data, as well as digitized resources (at <http://data.bnf.fr/>). They are encouraged by the French government to open data, the government recommends CC-by.

They have a "lab" on websites for developers who want to reuse the data. It is also used for visualization of metadata (e.g. timelines, maps, geographic info).

They offer OpenCat as a service for local libraries, who want to FRBR-ize their data more or less and present it in combination with linked open data in their own catalogues.

The BnF is focussing on ISNI right now. Last summer ISNI identifiers were loaded into the catalogue and will be included in bibliographic services.

In **Iceland** working groups have been established but not much action has been taken so far. They have deactivated the FRBR keys in Primo, because they did not work well enough.

Regarding **ISNI**:

- **Finland** is planning to be an ISNI agency, they are still working on it. It is interesting that they are trying to be the agency not only for libraries and archives, but for other communities as well. They are still trying to get the funds.
- **Sweden** and **Norway** also consider being an ISNI agency.
- The **British Library** discussed whether the Names project could be developed into a UK registration agency, but JISC has decided that Names no longer meets its needs. JISC wants to encourage collaboration between ISNI and ORCID to meet the needs to UK Higher Education Institutions.
- The **National Library of France (BnF)** planned to implement ISNI first and then look at being an agency. They will probably be officially registered next year. However, it is difficult to know what it costs (effort in staff and resources).

Regarding the **cataloguing of e-books**:

- The **National Library of France (BnF)** states that using work records will help creating records for e-books when records for print versions are available.
- This is supported by **OCLC/Netherlands**. It can be automated, but the number of records increases dramatically.
- In **Denmark** they are copy cataloguing: that is, using print version records and adding note and link. They use one record for the online version with links to the PDF etc.
- In **Sweden** they tried to automate the process as much as possible, but they do not heavily use print records, because there are too many differences.
- In **Austria/Germany** they create separate records (except for mass digitization projects, e.g. at the BSB). The records are shared with other regional networks.
- **Iceland** also prefers one record per electronic edition.

It was agreed that relevant links (to services, papers, tools, other initiatives) should be sent to the EURIG Secretary and documented on the EURIG Website.

Action: All

Closing

Alan will make a draft overview of the outcomes of the meeting and send it for agreement. It will then be posted on the EURIG website.

Action: Alan Danskin

Members were again invited to complete the survey.

Action: All members who have not already done so.

The Chair thanked the National Library of Sweden for their hospitality and smooth organization of the meeting.

The Chair closed the meeting and thanked members for their participation.

Appendix 1: Attendees

Austria	Austrian Library Network	Inge Neuböck
Austria	Austrian Library Network	Verena Schaffner
Croatia	National and University Library in Zagreb	Tanja Buzina
Denmark	Danish Agency for Culture	Camilla Riis Petersen
Denmark	Danish Bibliographic Center	Hanne Hørl Hansen
Finland	National Library of Finland	Marjatta Autio-Tuuli
France	ABES	Philippe Le Pape
France	Bibliothèque nationale de France	Gildas Illien
France	Bibliothèque nationale de France	Françoise Leresche
Germany	Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Verbundsysteme	Rita Albrecht
Germany	Bavarian State Library (BSB)	Gabriele Meßmer
Germany	Deutsche Nationalbibliothek	Christine Frodl
Great Britain	British Library	Alan Danskin
Iceland	National and University Library of Iceland	Ragna Steinarsdóttir
Italy	Casalini Libri	Giovanni Aldi
Latvia	National Library of Latvia	Anita Goldberga
Latvia	National Library of Latvia	Maira Kreislere
Netherlands	National Library of the Netherlands	Lian Wintermans
Netherlands	OCLC	Daniël van Spanje
Norway	National Library of Norway	Nina Berve
Poland	National Library of Poland	Marcin Roszkowski
Poland	NUKAT	Leszek Śniezko -- <i>Thursday Sept. 19 only</i>
Slovenia	National and University Library	Irena Kavčič
Spain	Biblioteca Nacional de España	Roberto Gómez
Sweden	National Library of Sweden	Miriam Säfström
Sweden	National Library of Sweden	Christer Larsson
Sweden	National Library of Sweden	Harriet Agaard -- <i>Friday Sept. 20 only</i>
Sweden	BTJ -- <i>not a EURIG member</i>	Anders Cato -- <i>Thursday Sept. 19 only</i>
Switzerland	Swiss National Library	Christian Aliverti

Appendix 2: Music WG report

Christine Frodl's (National Library of Germany) report on the Music WG:

At our last meeting in Madrid in September 2012 the chair provided background information on the RDA Music Joint Working Group, which was established in September 2012. This group is willing to admit a EURIG representative.

I had the task to arrange a focus group to form a European point of view on the topic of music. The EURIG Working Group on Music should consist of music cataloguing specialists (classical and popular music). In January this year, 4 participants were nominated and their names submitted to the RDA Music Joint Working Group with the information that a representative has to be chosen. For some reason the group was not able to nominate a chair and also did not start to work. I made a last try on 18 July 2013 with an e-mail, but nothing happened.

At the end of July, JSC member Kathy Glennan sent me an e-mail asking, if it might be better to contact the current chair of the Cataloguing Commission of the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres (IAML), to see if they would be willing to nominate someone to participate in the RDA Music Joint Working Group.

Appendix 3: Action points

What ?	Who ?	When ?
Complete membership survey 2013	Members that have not yet done so	Before October 1, 2013 Done
Report on results membership survey 2013	Katharine Gryspeerdt (BL)	Done
Prepare terms of reference for the Music WG	Verena Schaffner (chair) & Alan Danskin (vice-chair)	ASAP Done
6JSC/ALA/26: provide examples of hand colouring at manifestation level	Swiss National Library & BnF	Done
Integrate EURIG responses into BL responses	Alan Danskin (BL)	ASAP Done
Discuss (via e-mail) designators "Responsible corporate body" and "Reader"	Members (lead by Hanne Hørl Hansen / DBC ?)	
Define next year's action plan	Committee ³	
Review list of topics from the EURIG meeting in Frankfurt	Committee	
Overview what EURIG wanted to accomplish, where we stand now and what we still need to do	Committee	
Detect JSC proposals that affect music	Music Working Group	
Overview of the outcomes of this meeting	Alan Danskin (BL)	ASAP Done
Send relevant links (to services, papers, tools, other initiatives discussed at roundtable) to EURIG Secretary	Members that have not yet done so	

³ Note that there is a dependency with the action to review objectives from Frankfurt.

What ?	Who ?	When ?
Prepare document with relevant links (from roundtable discussion) for EURIG website	EURIG secretary	