

32nd CENL Annual General Meeting 4-5 June 2018 – Reykjavik, Iceland

Minutes

Executive Committee Present:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1) Roly Keating | Chair (UK) |
| 2) Marie-Christine Doffey | Vice-Chair (Switzerland) |
| Caroline Brazier | Treasurer (UK) |
| 3) Katarina Krištofová | Executive Committee Member (Slovakia) |

Members Present:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 4) Tigran Zargaryan | Armenia |
| 5) Johanna Rachinger | Austria |
| 6) Sara Lammens | Belgium |
| 7) Ismet Ovcina | Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| 8) Tatijana Petrić | Croatia |
| 9) Adolf Knoll | Czech Republic (Proxy – representing Martin Kocanda) |
| 10) Svend Larsen | Denmark |
| 11) Janne Andresoo | Estonia |
| 12) Kai Ekholm | Finland |
| 13) Laurence Engel | France |
| 14) Ute Schwens | Germany (Proxy – representing Elisabeth Niggemann) |
| 15) Filippou Tsimpoglou | Greece |
| 16) Ingibjörg Steinunn Sverrisdóttir | Iceland |
| 17) Sandra Collins | Ireland |
| 18) Andris Vilks | Latvia |
| 19) Wilfried Oehry | Liechtenstein |
| 20) Renaldas Gudauskas | Lithuania |
| 21) Monique Kieffer | Luxembourg |
| 22) Senka Naumovska | Macedonia |
| 23) Elena Pintelei | Moldova |
| 24) Lily Knibbeler | Netherlands |
| 25) Aslak Sira Myhre | Norway |
| 26) Tomasz Makowski | Poland |
| Kseniia Morozova | Russia (National Library of Russia)
(Proxy – representing Alexander Visly) |
| 27) Olga Zhlobinskaia | Russia (Boris Yeltsin Presidential Library)
(Proxy – representing Alexander Verschinin) |
| 28) Martina Rozman Salobir | Slovenia |
| 29) Jose Luis Bueren | Spain (Proxy – representing Ana Santos Aramburo) |

Proxy Voting Forms Received In Absentia:

- 30) Albania
- 31) Azerbaijan
- 32) Hungary
- 33) Romania
- 34) Sweden

In attendance:

Hans Petschar	Austria
Frédéric Lemmers	Belgium
Jasenka Zajec	Croatia
Isabelle Nyffenegger	France
Marko Cuculovski	Macedonia

Apologies:

Persida Asllani	Albania
Kerim Tahirov	Azerbaijan
Krasimira Aleksandrova	Bulgaria
Demetris Nicolaou	Cyprus
Mirian Khositashvili	Georgia
Laszlo Tüske	Hungary
Luca Bellingeri	Italy (Florence)
Andrea De Pasquale	Italy (Rome) NB. Had registered for CENL AGM.
Cheryl Falzon	Malta (Proxy form received on Tuesday)
Bogić Rakočević	Montenegro (Proxy form received on Tuesday)
Maria Inês Cordeiro	Portugal
Maria Răducu	Romania
Vladimir Gnezdilov	Russia (Russian State Library)
Laslo Blaskovic	Serbia
Gunilla Herdenberg	Sweden
Zülfi Toman	Turkey
Volodymyr I. Popyk	Ukraine
Cesare Pasini	Vatican (Proxy Ambrogio Piazzoni)

CENL Secretariat in attendance:

Marcie Hopkins	CENL Secretary (minutes)
Kate Marshall	CENL Secretariat (minutes)

Invited external speakers:

Guy Berthiaume	Library and Archives Canada
Ilona Kish	Public Libraries 2020

Observers from the National and University Library of Iceland Organising Committee:

Edda G. Björgvinsdóttir
Oddfríður Steinunn Helgadóttir
Andrea Dan Árnadóttir
Erlendur Már Antonsson

Day 1 – Monday 4 June 2018

1. Arrivals and Registration

2. Salutations from Host and Welcome from CENL Chair

Ingibjörg Steinunn Sverrisdóttir (ISS hereafter), Director of the National and University Library of Iceland (hereafter NULI), welcomed the Conference of European National Librarians (hereafter CENL) to Iceland and to the Annual General Meeting (hereafter AGM) 2018.

ISS stated that it was a great honour for NULI to host CENL in 2018 in the Conference Hall of the University of Iceland, formerly the university library - now restored and protected. With the creation of one new national and university library building, the importance of collaboration was realised – something also illustrated by the work of CENL. ISS stated that being a member of CENL is in line with NULI's own values and that she had personally attended all CENL meetings since 2007. ISS thanked CENL for inspiration through the years and stated her hopes for more of the same whilst in Reykjavik.

Iceland is celebrating anniversaries of both its sovereignty and the foundation of its national library in 2018. ISS referred to the existence of libraries in Iceland before the creation of a national library but affirmed the existence of nearly 300 libraries in Iceland today – big and small. There is one library for every 1133 people in Iceland.

ISS ended her opening salutations by wishing all delegates an effective and fruitful conference.

Roly Keating (hereafter RK) thanked ISS for her opening remarks and for the generous hospitality of the NULI. He also offered thanks to the NULI for their organisation and to the University of Iceland for the use of the wonderful Conference Hall.

RK stated his pleasure to see so many friends from across the continent of Europe present for the AGM. He emphasised the importance of fraternity and the exchange of ideas for the meeting ahead that would touch upon the past, present and future of libraries. RK emphasised the importance of human relations during times of great complexity in the world.

RK noted good representation at the AGM from right across Europe he also conveyed apologies for those colleagues not present, particularly for Gunilla Herdenberg (hereafter GH), Director of the National Library of Sweden and a member of the Executive Committee (hereafter EC), who had been called away at the last minute due to family reasons.

As a means of testing the microphones in the room, RK asked for introductions from around the room.

3. Approval of the Agenda – Paper 1

RK stated the AGM would include a diverse set of topics: the morning is business-focused, while the afternoon sees a move to a broad canvas with two special guests joining the AGM attendees. RK referenced Iceland's geographical position, at the juncture of the North American and Eurasian tectonic plates, as being reflected in CENL's external speakers: from Canada and from Belgium. RK also noted that one of these speakers would join the group from outside the national library context.

RK remarked that the agenda for Tuesday would include some of the preliminary findings from the survey of library spaces that was conducted by Hans Petschar (hereafter HP) of the Austrian National Library. The agenda on Tuesday would also include a presentation about Glagolitic scripts from the National and University Library of Zagreb in Croatia as well as a focus on how CENL has been developing its people and a look at the CENL Community. RK stated the agenda would conclude with the announcement of the host library for the AGM in 2020.

RK called for a vote, by show of hands, to approve the agenda. All members present (29) voted in favour of approving the agenda.

4. Approval of the proposed resolution of the Executive Committee of CENL to amend the articles of association – Paper 2

RK explained that Paper 2 and its appendices, already circulated with CENL members in advance, detailed the exact nature of the proposed changes being made to the CENL articles of association (also referred to as the organisation's statutes).

RK affirmed the need to amend the articles of association so that we can transact as members. He stressed the need to make decisions digitally without always having to gather in the same room.

RK confirmed there has been no amendment to the CENL statutes since 2008.

RK contextualised the vote at the AGM in Vienna in 2016 where the CENL membership agreed in principle that it may choose to let membership expire if members do not pay their fees. He explained that the EC had since worked with lawyers in Netherlands (because CENL is a foundation under Dutch law) to draft the amendments.

RK stressed these changes do not alter the function of organisation, merely the decision making process.

RK explained that in order to amend the articles, a 2/3 majority of the total membership of CENL is required to vote - in the room or where an absent member has pre-determined to represent another member by proxy.

RK declared 34 CENL members were represented in person or by proxy and thus the vote could take place. RK reminded those members present that, where they had agreed to act as a proxy for an absent director, a copy of that director's form could be found in front of them.

The importance of updating the decision making process - so that decisions like this can be passed in future writing (also to include digital writing – so online and by email) was referred to by RK as being very appropriate for libraries in a digital age.

RK asked for the approval of the proposed resolution of the Executive Committee of CENL to amend the articles of association of CENL in conformity with the draft deed drawn up by NautaDutilh N.V. and bearing the reference 80056330 M 19849702 (unofficial translation bearing the reference 80056330 M 20000170).

This vote was undertaken by paper. CENL Secretary Marcie Hopkins (hereafter MH) circulated with a

ballot box to collect the voting forms. RK explained these would be counted and verified by the CENL Secretary, with the result to be announced.

On counting, 33 votes had been cast all in favour (with one accidental abstention) and the approval was passed.

5. Formal election of the Executive Committee 2018-2021 – Paper 3

RK offered formal thanks to Marie-Christine Doffey (hereafter MCD) and Caroline Brazier (hereafter CB) who will both leave the EC at the end of this term.

RK then referred members to the application of five nominees for five positions on the EC for the term 2018-2021 (and noted that GH's term on the EC would run until March 2019). All nominees were detailed in Paper 3 and were summarised:

Roly Keating, Chair (UK)
Katarina Kristofova, Vice Chair (Slovakia)
Sara Lammens, Treasurer (Belgium)
Sandra Collins, EC Member (Ireland)
Hans Petschar, EC Member (Austria)

RK called for a vote by show of hands in favour of the nominees. 34 votes were received in favour and the nominees were duly elected to the EC.

RK offered an official welcome to the new EC.

6. Approval of Minutes of the 31st CENL Annual Meeting in London 2017 – Paper 4

RK referred members to the minutes of the 2017 AGM in London that had been circulated both as Paper 4 in advance of this AGM and prior to this via email.

RK called for a vote for approval of the minutes by show of hands. 34 members voted in favour of the approval of the minutes, with no corrections or comments, and these were formally adopted as an accurate record of proceedings.

7. Matters arising from Minutes

The actions and decisions taken at the 2017 AGM in London were summarised by RK as:

- 2016 minutes approved with minor change (location of IFLA corrected)
- The audit for 2016 to be received.
- Transfer of CENL funds from CENL Foundation 2 account (for TEL) to CENL Foundation 1 account approved
- In principle permission for EC to annually consider writing off doubtful debt with auditors approved
- Budget and action plan for 2018 approved
- Project to collate information about national library spaces, to be overseen by Hans Petschar (National Library of Austria) approved
- CENL 2019 AGM host announced as Norway

No further comments about these decisions and actions were received.

8. CENL Annual Report – Paper 5

The National Library of Switzerland's MCD presented highlights from the CENL Annual Report and stated that the EC and Secretariat have continued work with all members on a number of strategic priorities since the 2017 AGM.

MCD referenced the Secretariat based at the British Library in London and led by Marcie Hopkins. MCD summarised the Secretariat's diverse range of communications with all members over the course of the year: about membership fees; about the Erland Kolding Nielsen Grant (hereafter EKN); about skills and knowledge exchange bursaries; about plans for this the 2018 AGM; in connection with the CENL survey of library spaces; about legal deposit and harvested websites; regarding national libraries and research; and more. MCD expressed her thanks to MH and colleagues.

MCD spoke about the CENL website as a place for member libraries to network and to share expertise – particularly referencing reports from EKN Grants and other bursaries, and as the place to find previous AGM papers.

The EC's meetings over the past year were summarised: in August in Wroclaw; in November in Stockholm; virtually in February; and in April in London.

MCD spoke about the second issuance of CENL membership fees under the new fee model (that had been approved at the 2016 AGM in Vienna).

As this AGM will include further session about the EKN grants, MCD chose not to discuss them in details as part of the Annual Report. However, she stated the 2018 recipients would soon be announced and that the EC is looking forward to repeating the grant in 2019.

MCD reminded members that CENL's skills and knowledge exchange bursary programme was launched in 2017 with a budget of 30,000 Euros for the year and with each individual bursary available for up to 1000 Euros. MCD asked members to read the full reports from the bursaries awarded thus far on the CENL website but stated those awarded included: Bosnia and Herzegovina; Moldova; Bulgaria; Macedonia (twice); and Croatia.

MCD referenced the work on amendments to the CENL statutes throughout the year – now enacted as a result of this AGM's successful vote just a few moments earlier.

One other piece of work undertaken by the EC over the past year was a review of other professional library organisations in order to establish a collaboration framework for CENL, explained MCD. While no other partnerships were formally agreed by CENL in the past year, MCD stated that a framework was now in place.

MCD also made mention of The European Library (hereafter TEL) stating that the portal has remained frozen since December 2016 and CENL has instead increased its professional networking and advice services.

In referring to CENL's Working Groups, MCD referred all members to the full details within the printed annual report. However, she summarised:

The Copyright Working Group met twice: in Sweden and in Slovenia.

In Sweden the topics under discussion included Digital Single Marker Directive, the General Data Protection Regulation, e-Lending and national updates.

In Ljubljana the topics also included a lot of discussion on the state of the Directive in Council and the European Parliament.

The Copyright Working Group's activities with IFLA, LIBER, EBLIDA, Europeana and PL2020 were also referenced.

MCD mentioned that coordination between both the Copyright Working Group and the CENL-FEP Working Group would see the two group's chairs (Ben White, in the case of the Copyright Group) working together on drafting any public-facing documentation that relates to copyright law at an early stage.

MCD reported that the CENL-FEP Working Group met twice during the annual report period: in Frankfurt and in The Hague.

Ute Schwens, Chair of the CENL-FEP Working Group, had reported that the group had been drafting their terms of reference and refining its draft Text and Data Mining statement over the course of the year. Also, the Group also especially followed the discussion on the draft EU Copyright Directive on Out Of Commerce Works.

MCD made reference to the Group's suggestion that CENL could conduct a survey on TDM practices within national libraries.

MCD also referenced the Group's draft letter on out of commerce works that had been agreed in draft by the group but that the EC had refused this draft [the EC since asked to see a further clean copy of the draft and returned this to the group with a minor correction and ready for publication, subject to agreement from all members of the group].

The Working Group also covered new copyright legislation and debate; access to e-books; and the digitisation process.

MCD also reported highlights from the CENL's Representatives on the ISNI (International Standard Name Identifier) Agency with the British Library and the Bibliotheque nationale de France (BnF) currently providing these representatives.

MCD spoke about the representatives' focus on ISNI governance this year and also the interrelation between ISNI and VIAF (Virtual International Authority File).

MCD highlighted that all CENL members should contact the representatives Andrew MacEwan of the British Library and Emmauelle Bermes of the Bibliotheque nationale de France with any specific questions via the CENL Secretariat.

MCD concluded her presentation of the Annual Report with a welcome to new members joining CENL this year:

Czech Republic – Mr Martin Kocanda

Macedonia - Ms Senka Naumovska
 Romania – Mrs Maria Răducu

MCD invited questions from the CENL membership about the Annual Report – none were received.

9. Treasurer’s Report – Paper 6

RK introduced CB for her final report as CENL Treasurer and CB thanked the membership for making her tenure as Treasurer enjoyable.

Explaining that her presentation would cover highlights of the financial year, CB referred all members to full details in the written report (Paper 6) and stressed that she was happy to take questions at any stage.

CB explained her presentation would cover 1) Cash balances, 2) Audit and 3) Budget report for 2018.

CB also explained that the proposed budget for 2019 would be covered by incoming Treasurer Sara Lammens (hereafter SL) once CENL’s strategy discussion had taken place – later in the AGM agenda.

CB reminded members that the budget for 2017 was approved at 2016 AGM and clarified:

- CENL account number 1 is the working/operating account – this is where membership fees are received
- CENL account number 2 is the former TEL account.

CB showed:

CENL account 1	Bank Balance
Opening bank balance as at 1.1.2017	271 485 €
Total Income	403 728 €
LESS Expenses	77 088 €
Bank balance as at 31.12.17	598 125 €

CB stated that the income in this CENL account 1 is the CENL membership fees received – and also a transfer from CENL account 2.

For CENL account 2 (the former TEL account) CB showed:

CENL account 2	Bank Balance
Opening bank balance as at 1.1.2017	406 022 €
Total Income	47 610 €
LESS Expenses	283 576 €
Bank balance as at 31.12.17	170 056 €

CB explained that the CENL account 2 was, in effect, closed. However, CENL has long-term obligations towards former TEL staff and will hold certain funds in reserve should these financial obligations need to be met within a specific timeframe.

Income in this CENL account 2 comprises TEL fees paid in arrears by some member libraries. CENL did not collect any active TEL fees in 2017 – this is because TEL was effectively closed. In addition, CENL also received a refund from Europeana – there was some 2016 underspend with Europeana but this was repaid to CENL in 2017 because of Europeana’s audit obligations.

CB stated that as CENL obligations to keep money in CENL account 2 decrease with time (for the aforementioned obligations towards a former TEL staff member), funds can be transferred to CENL account 1.

CB went to explain the income and expenditure for CENL account 1:

For income, membership fees for 2017 had been budgeted for 119,500 Euros but in fact 120,262 Euros were received. Bank charges and transfer differences between currencies account for this difference. CB pointed out that some member libraries might choose to pay membership fees in advance.

For expenditure, the amount budgeted for 2017 was also 119,500 Euros. However, only 77, 087 had been spent. CB noted the large underspend for skills and knowledge exchange bursaries in 2017 but suggested that as members were now more aware of the bursaries available, it was expected that expenditure in this budget line would increase.

CB remarked that CENL’s main overspend in 2017 had been on audit and legal costs as a result of the work on the CENL statutes as well as an in-depth audit.

CB noted that when the membership met for the AGM in 2017 the 2016 audit had not been signed off, but confirmed that this sign-off had now taken place. In addition, the 2017 audit had also now been signed off.

CB continued her presentation with the 2018 position for the CENL accounts – covering the period up

to the end of April 2018:

CENL account 1	Bank Balance
Opening bank balance as at 1.1.2018	598 125 €
Total Income	124 521 €
LESS Expenses	60 218 €
Bank balance as at 30.4.18	662 428 €

CB suggested that the new membership fee model is simplified (there are no TEL fees to pay), which might explain why membership fee payments are received quickly.

CB further stressed that CENL account 2 is not active and showed the position as:

CENL account 2	Bank Balance
Opening bank balance as at 1.1.2018	170 056 €
Total Income	- €
LESS Expenses	30 056 €
Bank balance as at 30.4.18	140 000 €

CB reminded members that as the CENL liability for particular staff costs relating to TEL reduce year on year, future CENL Treasurers will have the option to reduce this account every year. The CENL account 2 shows the transfer to the CENL account 1.

In reviewing CENL income so far for 2018, CB confirmed that (to the end of April 2018) 37 CENL

members had paid their membership fees.

Expenditure in 2018 showed that only a small proportion of the skills and knowledge exchange bursaries budget had been spent. However, CB remarked that a number of bursaries had already been approved – but that the payment for these would only be made as the events took place and the necessary paperwork is supplied.

CB concluded the Treasurer’s Report by thanking the CENL family for their support during her tenure.

CB made a call for questions and points of clarification. None were received. [It was since noted that Paper 6 shows a negative integer “-762” when it should in fact show a positive integer “762”. This is a typing error and not a discrepancy in the figures themselves].

RK emphasised that this is a very interesting time for CENL as reflected by the figures for the EKN Grant and the Skills and Knowledge Exchange Bursaries, setting the scene for discussions to follow after the break.

The session concluded with a reminder that CENL has reserve funds. RK suggested to members that there may be new initiatives and new ways to invest these funds. He asked members to think creatively about what they would like to see happen with these funds, thinking about what the CENL community may do – these thoughts could be further explored after the break with the CENL strategy discussions.

The delegates took a short break.

10. CENL Strategic Plan 2018-2022 – Paper 7

RK welcomed everyone back after the break and stated that the strategic plan discussions would be an important agenda item for the group.

To contextualise, RK stated that coming to the end of the 2015-18 strategy was an interesting moment for CENL to reflect upon its vision and mission. There may be differences to and opportunities for the way forward because a group like CENL will always evolve and respond as the world changes.

RK spoke of how the CENL 2015-2018 strategy had, in some respects, been transitional: coming to the end of TEL and creating new ways of working together, with a focus on community collaboration and knowledge exchange.

RK suggested that now was the time to test the CENL priorities and to refine the language: an opportune moment for debate and exchange. RK asked colleagues to speak freely.

In creating the draft strategy document, RK referenced the EC’s preparatory discussions and input suggestions. A particular EC session in Sweden had prompted a discussion of the role of national libraries in underpinning democratic societies, providing access to information, supporting civil society and culture, and creating an intense debate across all cultures.

RK asked how do themes in the world around us influence national library debate and noted that all CENL members are beginning to engage with wider/broader audiences than the founders of institutions envisaged. This is all in addition to a deep commitment to academic and scientific research. As national libraries increase their offer to the public, they are reaching out to different communities.

RK also noted that this group has debated technology since its inception, but the digital revolution is still in play – it simply changes its characters every few years. Technology also affects people. Libraries are often a space for the interaction of the digital and the physical. Ten years ago, some thought the physical would disappear from libraries but this is not the case. The more digital our lives become, the physicality of national libraries acquires more meaning. How should we change these national library spaces? What should these spaces be?

Consideration of all of the above by the EC fed into the strategy that forms Paper 6. RK offered his particular thanks to CB for channelling these thoughts into the current strategy paper.

RK offered a brief overview of the strategy for 2018:

The vision of the proposed CENL strategy is to express identity as a community of world-leading memory institutions and to offer ways in which we contribute to development of our communities, nations and the wider world: these can be educational, economic, social and more.

The strategy is a rest for the CENL community. How do we do more together than we can by ourselves? How do we come together with library values?

RK stressed that the strategy sought a common language for national libraries and a common purposes across a broad geographical area with multiple languages. The draft strategy paper is an attempt at a refreshed language of vision.

CENL's mission was stated as being:

To advance the cause of Europe's national libraries, working better together and achieving more than we can do alone.

- 1) To engage with library audiences and understand need
- 2) To build capacity and professional expertise in CENL members
- 3) To advocate for CENL members and libraries in general

RK asked whether this was the right way for CENL to find a voice. How do we help each other to advocate for institutions individually but also at a European and at a global level?

He further posed the question of what CENL actually does. How do we spend our time and resources? CENL has a small part-time team to organise and shape activities but our scale as a community is great.

CENL's priority areas should reflect continuity of what CENL has always been, but these priority areas are also an attempt to clarify what we might do in the future. However, RK asked if CENL as a community was trying to do too much.

RK explained that the strategic plan for 2018-2022 aims to strengthen CENL members in four priority areas:

- 1) Support national libraries to increase their impact and to be strong organisations
- 2) Develop national library services
- 3) Develop as memory institutions
- 4) Strengthen CENL as a community

RK asked CENL members to break out into four groups to discuss each of these themes and offered

further insight into what each theme might cover:

1) Support national libraries to increase their impact and to be strong organisations.

The group might consider skills development. What have we learned already? What else would we like to do this area? Are we sharing information as effectively as we could?

What does advocacy mean for us now – is advocacy about common language or is it thematic?

Partnerships. We have some but are they the right partnerships? Good partnerships require investment and time.

2) Develop national library services.

CENL members are all service providers and have tough budgetary constraints – we have to decide which services to invest in. Are there common initiatives we might share? How might we share user needs? How do we express our service offer through the right spaces for the readers we serve? Sharing best practice about cultural best practice in the physical and digital realm?

3) Develop as memory institutions.

Libraries are the most forward-thinking institutions on the planet – we have to think many centuries ahead. Harnessing rich memories of Europe to share best practice – what are the future priorities for management of collections and their stewardship. This includes digital considerations. How do we make collective memory live in the digital age? Can we do better? Can we interpret the legal deposit idea more effectively in the digital age? RK noted that CENL's partnership with FEP exists, but are there other partnerships to fit into the wider intellectual value chain?

4) Strengthen CENL as a community.

This statement is not intended to be inward looking. It is intended to ask how we govern our affairs. Are there new ways of coming together that the new strategy might suggest? The role of working groups is ready for review as the groups reflect upon their terms of reference.

CENL has a website that has improved – but we would like to do more.

In conclusion, RK emphasised that the strategy was deliberately high level so that there was room for the membership and Secretariat to work within the terms. He reiterated that there was now the opportunity to review some of these ideas with breakout discussion and asked the groups to consider are these the right priorities. He also asked the groups for further thoughts.

The membership separated into groups for 25 minutes of discussion and on their return, the Chair asked the group leaders to summarise.

Svend Larsen summarised priority one – to support national libraries to increase their impact and to be strong organisations.

SL noted that the group's discussion reflected that some national libraries come from the EU and some do not. He also affirmed the group's commitment to sharing information amongst the CENL community. SL also conveyed that the group had asked about partnerships and the foundation of the existing working groups. The group had noted that if CENL was not about policy, what was role of

working groups? The group had also discussed the possibility for sharing funding opportunities such as Horizon 2020.

Filippos Tsimpoglou summarised priority two – to develop national library services [and subsequently provided a written summary of the group's discussions].

1. **Mission** of each National Library is keeping / preserving intellectual, cultural, social, historic, economic, scientific memories, for the next generation of the humanity.
 - a. Remark: This extends the role of the National Library in time (present and future) and in space (value not only nationally but for the whole humanity)
2. How
 - a. Developing / organizing **collections** and access to resources for exploiting and resisting to time
 - b. Organizing/developing/training (lifelong learning) audience, user groups, through open access with no discrimination
 - c. Collaborating in local / national/ international/ subject oriented levels. Exploiting complementarities
 - d. Ensuring physical spaces, infrastructure for e-publications. Procedures and actions needed.
3. CENL support to members
 - a. Organizing a **survey (I)** in order to know what is really happening. National libraries really act differently in each country either more as university libraries, public libraries, archives etc, according to priorities set by politics, social historical factors. Purpose of the survey:
 - i. Identifying commonalities of problems between different NLS
 - ii. in order to CENL attack them systematically
 - b. need to identify/know innovated services and disseminate them
 - i. need of a user centered thinking /
 1. current users and potential user not to be sacrificed for the abstract next generation users
 - c. rate the different actions/dimensions supported by the NLS. If know the percentage of budget spent in various directions, then this will help NLS to make financial decisions in order to turn priorities into realities.
 - d. A **survey (II)** concerning the roles that NL should / could play / act in order to **best practices** be shared and hopefully be adopted by others.
 - e. As a result of the two surveys CENL to setup of task oriented **sub-groups** (like copyright, FEP etc.) for strategically important target issues and areas with an expected deliverable in defined time duration, involving not only directors from the members but extending the involvement of senior management staff, turning CENL in being meaningful not only for the directors but also for NLS staff.

Kai Ekholm summarised priority three – to develop as memory institutions.

KE reported that preservation and access had been important topics of discussion. The group had asserted that national libraries should always find a more dynamic floor – we are not static organisations. With regards to preservation, there should be the resources to train staff and for more innovative preservation such as harvesting social media.

The group proposed that CENL's mission was not to rescue the past but to rescue the future.

Discussing access, the group stated that users will turn their backs if we do not service them as we

should. How do we use our market power? How do we make deals? KE cited the example of Germany and Elsevier – we can make things happen.

The group questioned if commercial companies partner with libraries or whether they corner or disrupt libraries. Copyright is the key word.

Lily Knibbeler summarised priority four - strengthening CENL as a community.

LK began by paying compliments to what the EC have done over the past years to strengthen the organisation.

The group had discussed developing the CENL website. They concluded the use of social media is a good idea. However, a communication plan should differentiate between reaching out to members and to the public. The group asserted the need for communication plan.

All agreed that the network (the feeling of support when you start out as a fresh family member) was one of the deepest and most enjoyable of the CENL experiences.

The group had also discussed how to help the Secretariat. Could there be distributed responsibility shared amongst the membership? Contributing allows one to feel more part of the membership.

The group also discussed exploring the possibility of enhancing cooperation beyond director level – for example senior managers.

The group had also discussed the geographic sub groups within Europe – there is a need to bridge these.

At this point RK opened the floor to questions and comments.

Aslak Sira Myhre commented that on reading the strategy he felt there was too much in it. In reality, CENL members come together for one annual meeting. He asked what is CENL to its members? ASM believes that the major role of CENL is to be a meeting place: informal and formal. It is the place to see faces and to be a springboard for further conversations. CENL should facilitate the sharing of experience. CENL is not an organisation to create policy or agenda. ASK recommended to limit CENL policy making as much as possible. Policy is made at a national level. The only instance where policy or lobbying might be relevant within the CENL context is in answer to EU policy (but even this will not be relevant for all CENL members). ASK suggests looking at the two most important points from the strategy proposal and doing these well. It is important not to attempt too many things that we cannot achieve.

Isabelle Nyffenegger questioned whether any CENL groups should be lobbying? Could their time be better spent sharing group practices and sharing national experiences at a group level. The terms of reference of the working groups have to be clarified – they are trying to find common positions but perhaps this cannot be done. This has to be discussed with the chairs of the groups especially.

RK concluded the strategy discussions by remarking that CENL is a plural group and more time could be spent on these important discussions. However, he asked the membership to vote to agree the general framework of the strategy (while acknowledging that in its current form it contained too many bullet points).

RK also suggested that the proposed budget for 2019 has some flexibility.

RK said that he had heard a lot of common spirit, value and support from the CENL membership for a great deal of what has begun to happen between members around collaboration, sharing and knowledge exchange.

It was also noted that CENL is entering an interesting debate about policy and lobbying position. To what extent can and should CENL be involved as an organisation in lobbying? In trying to digest what he has heard about the role of advocacy and lobbying, RK suggested a concrete action for the months ahead.

ACTION: Review of working groups. To confirm existing terms of reference. To consider whether we have the right working groups.

RK observed a strong and clear wish to share expertise among members. There was a commitment to demystifying each other's organisations and looking at each other's practices. There is a willingness to share experience without seeking to find perfection.

If part of the CENL value is building connections, then can we build those connections at other levels – beyond the directors. CENL will take this challenge very seriously.

RK suggested a possible project: if we are curious about a changing world, could there be fixed term working groups to look at particular issues? Even if we are not lobbying in the old-fashioned sense we should be aware of what the market is doing. Is there a theme about libraries in publishing to be explored in the future? Could we have a future speaker from outside the library context at a future CENL AGM?

LK added that the Sustainable Development Goals 2030 should be included in the CENL strategy. The strategy should relate to these in a particular way – perhaps just to include reference to these in the strategy.

ACTION: CENL will think about SDGs within its own strategy and on the global stage (the SDG will also be reflected upon on at CDNL 2018).

RK asked for a vote to approve the strategy for agreement in principle, subject to discussions today. 33 members voted in favour by a show of hands and agreement of the draft strategy, subject to amendments discussed within the meeting.

RK asked Sara Lammens, as incoming Treasurer, to introduce the proposed CENL budget for 2019.

SL thanked the membership for electing her to the EC and stated that she was honoured to be taking up the Treasurer role. SL offered particular thanks to CB and the Secretariat for their work so far.

SL explained that the proposed budget for 2019 is very similar to the previous year – this is because the membership's strategy discussion has only just taken place and it was important not to suggest big changes to the proposed budget at this stage.

SL explained that the CENL income is from membership fees and remarked that there were two small changes within the budget to the EKN and Skills and Knowledge Exchange lines – adjusting 5000 Euros from one line to the other in order to facilitate three EKN grants in 2019. SL confirmed that all other lines in the budget remained the same.

SL asked for questions for the budget and none were received. Thus SL called for a vote in favour of the proposed budget for 2019 by a show of hands. 33 votes were received in favour of the 2019 budget.

11. Group Photo

This was taken on the steps of the University Conference Hall by a photographer organised by the NULI [and printed copies of the photo were distributed to all CENL members for the end of the AGM].

12. Lunch

Lunch was served in the adjacent building, the University's restaurant.

RK welcomed everyone back after lunch and offered thanks to ISS for the hospitality. RK stated that the afternoon ahead would be centred around presentations from different perspectives: both from outside the European national library context.

13. Keynote Presentation: Dr Guy Berthiaume – Paper 8

Katarina Kristofova (KK) introduced Dr Guy Berthiaume (GB), Librarian and Archivist of Canada, to the group and welcomed him to the stage stating that all were keen to hear the Canadian national library perspective in a digital age: "The idea and purpose of national libraries and their future in a changing world".

GB offered thanks to RK for inviting him to speak at the CENL AGM and said that his initial reaction had been that he did not have anything to offer such a serious and distinguished group as CENL. However, RK had explained that the group were looking for a voice from outside – someone who is not running a national library in Europe. GB stressed that he did not have anything to teach the CENL group but would speak "without hope and agenda" (Love Actually).

The recent initiatives of Libraries and Archives Canada (LAC) keep in mind the democratisation of knowledge that has been seen in the wake of digitisation. GB reflected that 45 years ago only graduate students and faculty used national libraries – and this had certainly been GB's own experience when using the Bibliotheque national de France (BnF) at that time. However, appetite for knowledge is now difficult to satisfy. When, on 14 July 1988, Francois Mitterrand announced the intention to create an entirely new type of library the long-standing distinction between national library and public library was blurred: the British Library (BL) and the BnF are just two examples of that manifestation.

LAC has also brought itself physically closer to public libraries. Last year LAC moved its offices to Vancouver Central Library (from a more remote location). This geographical shift has borne fruit: with attendance, but also with the receptiveness of staff towards their new colleagues. Services will be shared with Ottawa public libraries by 2024: the wedding of national library and public libraries. There is budget provided for this and the only limit for this project will be imaginations.

LAC are redefining their relationship with clients (the terminology is intended - users is less commercial). Key to this are Amazon, Google and especially Wikipedia who have all altered LAC service delivery models. LAC clients are now being encouraged to transcribe, tag, translate and describe library documents. (LAC have also noted that self-regulation and self-correction are an integral part of

Wikipedia, although others' concerns about Wikipedia are noted). LAC is exploring the activities in which they are involved. Some are activities that might not immediately be associated with national libraries.

GB referred to the IFLA and CDNL 2016 survey with 46 responses from 45 serving countries (including 27 from European libraries) that revealed that collection development, preservation and conservation, making collections accessible and outreach are activities shared by the majority of libraries. The development of library standards and reading/literacy is an activity shared by more than 70% of the participating libraries surveyed.

However, GB referred to Foucault and stated that systems are best understood by what goes on in their margins: for LAC the number and variety of initiatives and activities is important, perhaps more so than the originality of any one issue. He went on to introduce key LAC themes that would feature in the presentation ahead:

1. Willingness to welcome new users.
2. Consequences of new roles played by users.

National libraries are increasingly used both digitally and physically by the public at large. GB cited the increase in both BnF and BL attendance with the idea that the more people use the web to access digital collections, the more they also want to visit the physical spaces. GB recognises the importance of making collections available online, and of working with the private and public sector to achieve this. The documentary community (libraries as well as archives) is doing as much as it can to make material available online with services such as Europeana, Gallica and the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA). DPLA brings together a collection of over 60 million items from thousands of contributing institutions. The free and open resources are offered to users and its success is attributed to the network of partners with a commitment to share.

Canada's National Heritage Digitization Strategy

The DPLA was kept in mind when GB created Canada's National Heritage Digitization Strategy – making accessible through a single search instrument all Canadian materials digitized by combined heritage institutions. These include published and unpublished digitized material from archives, libraries, museums, galleries, historical associations and other memory institutions. 58 organisations pledged an interest to partner and there was funding from private sector. LAC was a link in the chain (not at the top of the pyramid). The strategy was developed by a 21-strong steering committee and LAC is only one among 58 others. Players are determined by governance layers. Cultural heritage partners will be able to better communicate to members about what they can do with material they have discovered.

BANCTEC

Some examples of these heritage materials made available include the WW1 files at LAC, which are a major source for genealogy. 3000 requests are received a year for information from these files, but the physical copies are fragile. However, all 640,000 files will be online by WW1 anniversary with the use of the BANCTEC scanner. Technicians took the double-side scanner intended for cheques (BANCTEC) and used this for heritage digitisation.

Project Naming

Back in 2001 LAC teamed up with Nunavut College and Government to digitise and identify 500 Inuit photographs. The project has digitised over 10,000 photographs since 2001. This project has seen families reunited and mysteries solved because all the information is available on website. The project won the Livres Hebdo prize. A clear example of preserving Canada's indigenous heritage and providing digital access tools and access to materials.

Preserving Canada's indigenous languages and cultures

Acknowledging the importance of language as part of indigenous communities has seen LAC focus on oral histories and records. LAC will also create jobs for indigenous peoples in locations across Canada. LAC has already gathered the knowledge circle to advise the project in a way that is culturally appropriate when digitizing First Nations, Inuit and Métis content/supporting communities.

Social Media

LAC uses social media extensively to promote its collection and spread the word about events, partnerships, programs and services. The cornerstones of this social media usage for LAC are Awareness, Engagement and Collaboration.

Social media allows dissemination of public programming events and services that is otherwise limited in media hours which must be bought. Social media is used by LAC to highlight elements of collections that tie in with current events. #onthistday For example, the 2018 Winter Olympics in Canada provided an interesting platform.

Sometimes LAC also just take a chance on what social media themes might interest people – for example, #ROADTRIP of 2015 reached very large numbers of people.

Wolverine's military record being made available online was an April Fool joke that was one of the most popular posts ever for LAC. It reached over 6 million people and shone a bright light on the digitisation of WW1 material just mentioned.

May 4 has also proved a popular theme, drawing attention to Phase2 of the LAC Preservation Centre soon to be built in the suburbs of Ottawa. Posts with Darth Vader were irreverent and amusing to attract attention, but informative and cultivated to increase LAC's reputation. LAC is now a leader in social media within the Government of Canada.

There are also risks with social media. However, GB sets the stage for social media staff to be as a daring as their imaginations allow – and they have been lucky with some of the more audacious initiatives thus far. GB is sure that at some stage this will not always be the case but GB will stand by his staff.

GB has also been encouraged to use personal social media (although he still does not have quite as many followers as Kim Kardashian). Social media borders between private and public lives. However, being able to attach a face and a personal message improves chances of engaging with citizens.

DIGILAB

DIGILAB – client focused innovations started in March 2017. Digilab allows engagement with clients and collections in different ways – clients can choose the materials they want to scan, and proceed on their own, using our state-of-the-art equipment (as long as not covered by copyright). The equipment is provided free-of-charge in exchange for users leaving copies of digital material they have created. Clients have digitised photographs of Japanese-Canadian internment camps, Shakespeare's plays in Canada, photographs of 1920s and 1930s Ottawa, and much more.

CO-LAB

Another example of the active role played by LAC clients in innovative services is CO-LAB. This allows the general public to transcribe, tag, translate and describe digitized records and manuscripts in LAC's collection.

Initially the public was invited to transcribe the Coltman Report of 1818 – one of the best sources of information on the fur trade war. The entire report (534 pages) had been transcribed by the public in less than one month. This pilot project was such a success that the public were then invited to transcribe Lady Macdonald’s diary, which offered a vivid insight into the politics of the new nation, and took 25 days for the public to transcribe. Based on these successes, LAC launched CO-LAB. GB quoted Alberto Manguel, “A national library can, I believe, be a sort of creative workshop, and a place in which material is stored for future readers to find clues in order to imagine better worlds.” Libraries cannot be reduced to the functions of collecting and preserving works. We are also present at the beginning of the creative chain, providing inspiration and material to artists of all disciplines.

GLAM

LAC has been pursuing participating in the GLAM sector in Canada for a few years to further highlight the value of libraries. The motivation for working together with galleries, libraries, archives and museums was that the GLAM sector as a whole had not previously been involved in future of culture in the digital age. A 2016 summit on the value of GLAM – Value of Libraries, Archives and Museums in a Changing World attracted 300 people and 30 speakers. The summit addressed tough questions:

Since digital access is everywhere, why build new libraries?
Virtual museums offer culture and history to the world...why the expense of brick and mortar?
Can’t you get everything you need from archival platforms?

The sector collectively adopted Ottawa declaration in December 2016, acknowledging how much GLAM have in common:

- Increase collaboration between our institutions to catalyze new partnerships that spark creativity and enhance engagement.
- Develop innovative programs and services to empower us to engage our publics.
- Enrich and expand access to our collections to ensure we contribute significantly to the public good and sustainable development.

To keep momentum going beyond the summit LAC established a working group and also organised a second GLAM Summit in 2018, “Taking it to the next level”, with four drivers:

- Working with the communities
- Initiatives with Indigenous peoples
- Relationships with the private sector
- Government priorities

The conclusion of this second GLAM summit was that we need a supporting narrative that demonstrates the value and the breadth of GLAM’s social and economic benefits:

“If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.” (African proverb).

Fake News

Addressing fake news at LAC was described as a very current topic. Disinformation is prevalent. Libraries do not have the luxury of staying on the sidelines – we have a duty to help our fellow citizens. GB remarked that people look to the media for affirmation of their existing biases but they look to libraries for information. Libraries are perceived to be trustworthy – as stated in the Pew Research Institute Report. LAC has created roundtables for discussion of fake news issues.

Questions

GB's presentation ended with a round of applause from the CENL membership and then RK invited questions from the floor.

FT offered thoughts about contradiction of libraries as affirmative vs. tagging/public participation.

Aslak Sira Myhre (ASM) asked if public participation was not just limited to crowdsourcing and tagging, but did it also extend to metadata. Do LAC distinguish between crowd-sourced metadata and library metadata? LAC will come back on this

CB remarked upon the innovative way that LAC tackle some problems and had been particularly impressed by the innovative technologies highlighted, especially the BANC machines to digitise. CB asked what LAC did to overcome the conservatism within the library in tackling their own hurdles. GB responded that LAC has innovative managers. LAC also invests in awards and contests – this creates stimulus and people feel that they are values. GB also stated that he accepts error.

Ute Schwens (US) commented upon the brilliant initiative for photo naming and asked whether the data gathered could be offered to the research community and whether this data set would then become valuable. GB responded positively – this is an unending source of research.

Sandra Collins (SC) commended LAC on the warm use of social media and particularly liked that GB will stand by staff in social media usage.

RK asked if LAC had to recruit new people for social media. GB responded that LAC have communications professionals in place.

ASM commented that flaws in metadata that were previously only seen by the librarian are now part of the DNA of younger generations – self-correction happens, it is part of the ethos that nobody is perfect – not even librarians.

Frederic Lemmers (FL) asked what the place of digital humanities within the LAC strategy was. Are they considered like social media community? GB responded that LAC has not been as aggressive on digital humanities because the university community in Canada has a lot of digital resources to begin with – being often rich and well-endowed. Students only come to the national library if there are unique materials. LAC resources are used but they are not the animateur.

Laurence Engel (LE) thanked GB for the vision and asked for further details about Fake News roundtables. LE thought this would help to explain national libraries' role.

LK asked what impact engaging with different clients and users online (so users are essentially becoming partners through crowd sourcing) would have on our physical spaces? For example, why should one place ICT development in a separate part of the building?

RK asked about the National Heritage Digitization Strategy and the private sector funding that GB had mentioned for this. How has funding been raised? Was it commercial investment or sponsorship? GB responded that money was raised to get started quickly. LAC covered a very small number of staff and approached private foundations for philanthropic funding. Private money attracts attention to the project, gives it credibility, and invites others to invest hard.

RK concluded the session and asked the group to break for 15 minutes.

14. Presentation - Ilona Kish

Ilona Kish was introduced to CENL members by SC who explained that Public Libraries 2020 is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and is run by Reading and Writing Foundation. SC referenced that this is an exciting time for PL2020 as it moves into next stage and she looked forward to the perspectives ahead from Ilona Kish.

IK thanked RK and CENL for inviting her to speak and introduced two different but interrelated themes: 1) What PL2020 has been doing in Brussels; 2) Opportunities in the post 2020 landscape.

IK stated her wish to share her vision for the public library of the future: a place of connections not just collections. The project has intended to develop a connected library field across the EU and the wider European space.

IK hopes to leave CENL members with a sense that the EU offers some very specific opportunities for the library field at this time - there is a need for a strategy for all European libraries to engage with the EU going forward.

PL2020 was funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation as part of the Gates Global Libraries programme. There are countries in Europe that meet the development criteria – for infrastructure and digitisation.

A strategy was needed to address policy issues at EU level and this ended up being the Reading and Writing Foundation in the Netherlands. This strategy is what IK was hired to set up (but her background is in buying chemicals and lobbying in Brussels). IK knew how to advocate in a sector where advocacy and lobbying are not a direct consequence of the sector.

IK began working for PL2020 in 2014. When she spoke to policy makers, they had typically never spoken with a library advocate. Policy people had not necessarily been in a library in 10 or 20 years.

IK started with very simple message to policy makers: Did you know that 1 in 5 of the European population visits a library every year. She rarely talked about books and spoke instead about the other areas in which libraries are engaging – all areas that could be used to engage with policy makers. PL2020 works closely with EBLIDA and IFLA to put libraries on the map.

Trade publishers and academic publishers have aggressively lobbied European Parliament. The goals for libraries were simple: to build up political influence and visibility and to generate funding opportunities.

PL2020 had no branding at the start of the project and IK spent a lot of time learning the political landscape. The review of Copyright Directive gave PL2020 the opportunity to be part of a particular initiative and IK decided to get politicians and policy makers into libraries, to see what was happening. A 30-minute visit can be more effective than lobbying time and position papers.

PL2020 initiated GenerationCode, asking libraries to show technologies from their libraries in the Parliament. PL2020 also launched an MEP library lovers group, an interest and support group (100 members of the European Parliament). This has been a great way to engage, influence and access members of the European Parliament.

Going forward, libraries might look more aggressively towards the EU for funding positions. They need brokers to build partnerships with each other across Europe. Funding may be better in the next period. Social inclusion needs to be talked about more. Public libraries have something to say about building more integrated societies. European social funds are large pots of money that could be accessed by libraries.

IK noted that European elections were coming up in 2019 and that digital skills and media literacy were of interest to EU. IK knows that the library sector is an innovative sector (open data projects in Denmark are cited as a good examples – democratic empowerment and citizenship coming together). Talking about the ways in which libraries are digitally innovative is attractive and interesting to European policy makers.

IK looked at the EU timeline for 2018-19 and the Multi Financial Framework. Protect Empower Defend is the title of the new EU budget proposal. IK also noted that the EU is losing one of its largest contributing partners (the UK – through Brexit). IK noted programmes within the proposed budget that could be of broader benefit to the library sector: a) Increased funding for Erasmus+ programme; b) More money for Horizon programme; c) Reboot of European Social Fund.

There is already a better understanding at EU level of what libraries could and will do in the future and IK would enjoy working with libraries on this.

SC opened the floor to questions and commented that she was very sad to hear that commissioners are not familiar with libraries at all. SC also asked, as individual libraries are tied to sovereign states, how important is it for national libraries to be in Brussels and influencing decisions?

KE referenced the long-standing debate about cultural heritage. KE has not seen public libraries contribute to digitisation (they see this as a national library job). IK suggested that the library sector as a whole has to work together to be visible on the broader landscape: co-operate meaningfully because political decision makers do not have the time for internal distinctions.

RK noted that IK has been engaging with the public library sector itself. He noted the UK has had a morale dip and funding dip – particularly on the public library side. Without wishing to generalise, is this a pan-European phenomenon? What observations does IK have from journey into the public library sector at continental level?

IK says the situation in the UK is very particular. E.g. Philip Pullman was talking about library closures at the Hay Festival. The picture is mixed across of Europe. Public libraries need to be better about statistics. It is hard to map what users are doing in public libraries when they are not borrowing a book. However, the number of new library buildings is hard to reconcile with number of library closures. The public library sector is booming in some areas. There are extremes of performance and engagement and it is an “innovate or die” situation for public libraries.

IK commented that professional advocacy is in its infancy in the library sector. “Librarians are quite shy”. 75% of librarians questioned thought having an advocacy strategy was a good idea. 25% actually had said strategy.

ASM spoke about the political situation in Norway being totally different to what IK has just described. The idea of there being a politician that does not know their local library is inconceivable – even individual parties have their own library groups. IK responded that situation in Norway is different and great – there is one single library card across the whole of Norway.

SC emphasised that in Ireland national, public and university libraries are all very different. This effects how libraries might engage with their European politicians.

CB remarked on how copyright lobbying has been successful and that we had a joined up story to tell. Many other areas are not as joined up. She asked IK where she would advise libraries who don't have a track record of advocacy activities to start? In the UK are people worried about the politicisation of library services (siding with one political party against another by looking at issues). IK said in response that advocacy is part of library life. Look around in your community. Do we know who we are (we're a values based sector) We're embedded in society. IK thinks every national library and every library should have an advocacy strategy.

IK asked what the group interest in European funding was. SC responded that individual capability to seek funding was very different. Different national libraries have very different interests for EU funding. SC drew the session to a close and thanked IK for her contribution.

15. National Library of Norway – Hosts of 2019

ASM presented a multimedia show to introduce Mo I Rana as the location if the CENL AGM in 2019. He suggested a compact CENL meeting, perhaps happening in the conference hotel itself. The focus in Mo I Rana, where the National Library of Norway is building a new repository in the mountains, will be 'common challenges'. ASM also referenced the Artificial Intelligence Librarian, Nancy, who is already cataloguing in Dewey!

ASM invited all to prepare for the AGM by coming to Oslo in December 2018 for the first library conference dedicated to artificial intelligence, along with the IIF conference.

16. Summary of the Day and Wrap-Up

RK summarised the morning of business that had seen changes to the statutes approved; a new EC in place; detailed discussions about the framework for the strategy beyond 2018 that will also examine the right way to review the working groups; and approval for the 2019 budget passed.

RK expressed his very grateful thanks to both speakers who had painted a dramatic picture of the library landscape.

RK reminded all CENL members of the arrangements for the gala dinner at 19.00 and looked forward to seeing members back for the remainder of the AGM the next morning.

Day 2 – Tuesday 5 June 2018

17. Arrivals and Registration

RK welcomed all back for a prompt start and thanked ISS for her hospitality in hosting the CENL gala dinner the previous evening. RK introduced Hans Petschar (HP) from the Austrian National Library to present.

18. Library Spaces – Paper 9

HP opened his presentation by thanking all members who had taken part in the CENL survey so far and said that his presentation will offer a only a preliminary view of the survey results. He said that he hopes to give some ideas for the breakout sessions.

The discussion at the 2017 AGM centred on the feeling that the library world has changed frenetically. We have seen new library buildings all over the world. Some libraries have reinvented themselves and this is certainly true for national libraries. We are in a phase of permanent transition which has been caused by the digital revolution and changes within the economic and social environment. HP said that the ensuing survey intended to collect and analyse changes within national library spaces by using empirical data to measure phases of transition.

The overall goal of the survey was to answer some fundamental questions such as who we are, where do we come from and where are we going as national libraries.

HP gave an overview of the survey chapters which could also be studied in the plain copy of the survey (Paper 9). To date, 31 responses to the survey have been received which was a good response but more responses were needed. HP said that he would be delighted to receive outstanding data.

SCOPE AND CORE FUNCTIONS

All 31 responses received understandably show that we are national libraries, but the results also show that some are also public libraries (5) and the same number of libraries are university libraries. Not all national libraries have a legal deposit function with 16% not being legal deposit libraries. Some national libraries share their legal deposit function.

PHYSICAL SPACES

The CENL survey has collected this information for the first time from the CENL community.

Members in the room noted that there had been some interpretation of data presented (for example the BL storage spaces gave data for St Pancras only, and not other sites). There is also the possibility to make this public on the website at a future time.

ACTION: Upload information processed thus far to CENL website for members to interpret and correct

HP remarked that Denmark shows that it has 18 sites – as a result of the merger last year. HP remarked that by comparison the UK previously had multiple sites, but now has 3 (St Pancras. Boston Spa. Stockton on Tees) [although the historical number of sites had not been referred to in the returned survey]. HP asked whether the number of sites related to storage. Are external storage buildings being newly created?

HP noted that the data shows that the BnF reported the largest total m2 [the BL later added that the data it had returned for this question related to its St Pancras site only and was not a direct comparison]. HP reported a preliminary result showing the amount of library spaces open to the public. However, he noted that more work is required here to check the data.

In looking at the age of library buildings, HP drew attention to some differences and inconsistencies in the data (the question of when library buildings were commissioned vs. when was the first building opened vs. when was the current building opened).

LOCATION OF NATIONAL LIBRARY BUILDING

The survey included a map showing the situation of national library buildings within the city environs. HP asked whether a national library considered as part of an urban planning process. Could the data gathered here be used for other libraries to make a case with their own ministries if they are planning a building project?

The data also attempted to look at reading room sizes as a percentage of total space. HP stressed again that all data findings are preliminary and is likely that further checking and interpretive work is required.

STAFFING AND OTHER

Data gathered from the survey included looking at an overview of staffing levels. Other information asked for included professional memberships or contribution to union catalogues.

PROPOSALS

Subject to the outcome of the breakout sessions, HP proposed to continue and complete the survey and to create a fixed-term CENL working group on library spaces for 2018-2021 to create a network of contacts comprised of 3-5 volunteer experts from national libraries.

The group divided into three breakout sessions to further debate the issues that have begun to be explored through the survey.

GROUP 1

CB reported back from the first group who stressed the data is raw and early with inaccuracies. The first thing the group wanted to do was to look at the data again. Now that we understand more about what is being asked, we can be more accurate in the response.

ACTION: Publish data in this raw form on the 'members only' area of the CENL website. Encourage people to revisit, update and correct.

Definitions used within the survey were discussed. There are very different trends affecting us as a community of libraries. For example, we might have tight resources and fewer staff. Sometime space comes at the end of a series of questions. Sometimes space is the primary question, for example if one is looking at a building project.

The group asked whether it might be better to compare like with like. Perhaps look at library new buildings and compare those and then look at older buildings and compare those. Is this something sub groups might look at?

The group noted that the survey talks about some traditional terms "Reading Rooms" and "Staff Space" but actually definitions of these are changing.

The group discussed partnering space. This is a really important concept for national libraries as they partner with other organisations.

The group concluded that the survey and more accurate data gathering is a big piece of work, but there is the potential to bring out some important themes.

GROUP 2

ISS reported back from the group who had discussed staffing. The group discussed a general reduction of staff across libraries. Automation and more information online has effected staffing levels. There are more efficient working processes that have resulted in changes to services. The group noted that entire library buildings are acting as Reading Rooms, which also alters services.

The group had reflected upon other questions that could have been asked as part of the survey: opening hours was one consideration. University libraries might be open 24/7 but perhaps without offering a full service.

The group had some concrete suggestions for the survey: 1) Use data for internal strategic discussions with staff groups, 2) Use the data in library advocacy roles.

GROUP 3

Tomasz Makowski (TM) reported that his group had spoken about location and urban spaces – a narrow theme from the slides. The group had recommended continuing and completing the survey.

The group had remarked that as national libraries are predominantly located in the capitals, they are often very visible and prominent buildings.

The group asked whether national libraries should be located in governmental areas or university areas, or indeed in areas convenient for a majority of users. They asked how many libraries were located in governmental districts. The group looked at Vienna as a case study. It has a historic building which lends itself to exhibitions and also income from fees.

How should national libraries communicate with external and internal visitors?

The group also discussed legal deposit (is storage away from the building in the capital?) and looked at the BnF as a case study.

HP concluded by thanking all for their input. If all are in agreement that this information is relevant to the group, then the surveys can be reshared and more accurate data sought.

HP made a call for volunteers for a working group – 5/6 members. He would like to suggest one workshop over the course of the year with the possibility of CENL bursary applications offering the opportunity for travel assistance.

HP stated the preliminary data could be shared internally and not yet publically but this may be possible in future. RK suggested this could be a base of knowledge that we have not previously had about each other.

The members had a short break.

ACTION: EC to reflect practically about how we might take this information forwards.

19. Glagolitic Scripts – Paper 10

RK introduced Tatijana Petrić and Jasenka Zajec from the National and University Library in Zagreb, Croatia. TP thanked colleagues for the opportunity to present about the Glagolitic Script Portal that the NULZ have launched. The project sought the digital unification of original and heritage material. Although the script is not read by the general public, it is far from being forgotten and is intensively studied by archaeologists. TP advised that during the European Year of Cultural Heritage the portal had been presented to the world. She passed the floor to JZ to present about the specifics of the portal.

Glagolitic script the oldest known Slavic alphabet. It appeared in the 9th century and was created by brothers Cyril and Methodius. It was intended to teach the common people Christian faith in their own language and script and spread in almost all Slavic lands. The script persisted in Croatia until the 19th Century and Glagolitic is derived from “to perform a mass” or “to speak”.

JZ presented some examples of Glagolitic script – both in printed form and in manuscripts. She explained that many Glagolitic documents are preserved in Croatia, but they may also be found in heritage institutions in Europe and beyond. Thus it is difficult to see all the documents. The NULZ decided to create a portal to provide access.

The project aims and scope are to a) Identify, protect and preserve Glagolitic heritage, b) Digitise original documents in Glagolitic script, c) Virtually collect all digitised documents in one portal (from Croatian institutions, first phase) and d) Collect data and published works about Glagolitic script from 1001 (first document) to today (latest research).

The partners included institutions in Croatia and elsewhere, such as the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Old Church Slavonic Institute, University Library of Rijeka, University Library of Zadar, the Friends of Glagolitic Script and the Senj Museum Association. The target audience for the portal is researchers, users, and the general public.

At present the portal is only available in Croatia. It includes resources about Glagolitic scripts (chapters, books, etc.) and can be browsed in the usual way but also via IIF and also in a “Pinterest” type way. Documents are presented in context: e.g. original item, work of art inspired by original, transcription, secondary source (article) about original item. Each document is placed on a timeline within the portal. The timeline illustrates how interest in and study of Glagolitic books has changed over the centuries.

Users of the portal extend beyond researchers to popular science, artists, education, souvenirs, tourist routes. The planned portal developments include continuous digitisation, inclusion of new types of material (sound, video), improved description and display of data, wider cooperation incl. adding work of researchers and cooperation with heritage institutions abroad.

NULZ have already contacted South East European National Libraries (SEENL), who meet once a year, about further collaboration and JZ thanked all the SEENL libraries present for their support so far. SEENL libraries had a number of responses about Glagolitic scripts in their own collections and two items from the National Library of Bulgaria are already included in the portal, as are four from the National Library of Slovenia.

The portal has already become the starting point for Glagolitic script. The NULZ would like to collaborate with other institutions and invited all CENL members to contribute.

20. Developing Our People – In Partnership – Paper 11

RK introduced this section as one of CENL's core themes in the past and newly agreed strategies and said that Gunilla Herdenberg, who had planned to present this section, was sorry not to be here to present.

MH introduced the grants and bursaries as a very positive element of the CENL community. The Erland Kolding Nielsen Grant celebrates the contribution that Erland Kolding Nielsen made to the national library sector over the time of his longstanding career as Director General of the Royal Library of Denmark. The Annual Grant awards up to €5000 Euros to a CENL member institution to foster international engagement and knowledge exchange with libraries in other European countries. In 2017, CENL awarded two EKN grants in total, one to the National Library of Moldova and the other to the National Library of Latvia.

The National Library of Moldova held an international conference with attendees from five different countries with the aim to learn more about the European library landscape. The event was well attended with 130 participants from within Moldova and from overseas. A follow up event was held in December 2017 at the National Library of Lithuania, at which both libraries signed a collaboration agreement.

Andris Vilks (AV) introduced the National Library of Latvia's project which was a result of the EKN grant awarded in 2017. AV thanked colleagues for the privilege to present during the CENL meeting.

The seminar held in May in Riga, Latvia, was entitled 'Book Exhibitions and their Audiences'. It was organised in partnership with 5 national libraries from Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark and Germany.

AV explained the motivations to organise the seminar: a) the tradition of exhibiting the treasures of the National Library of Latvia – since 1964 by the Department of Rare Books and Manuscripts; b) international success of the exhibition 1514. Book. 2014 (2014) in the new library building; c) opening of the new, modern permanent exhibition Book in Latvia in 2016 – designed for a wide range of audiences; d) a wish to continue developing the book-exhibition sector in cooperation and interaction with colleagues from different countries.

Facilitated by Diana Walters, the seminar welcomed 27 participants from 12 countries. It covered 8 case studies on book exhibitions including from 6 national libraries: the German National Library, Austrian National Library, Royal Danish Library, the National Library of Armenia, the National Library of Latvia, and the National Library of Belgium. A panel discussion on the first day and group work on the second day produced some interesting results. The seminar initiated a cooperation perspective, planned for Dublin, Ireland in 2019.

AV presented the many positive comments from those who had participated in the seminar and closed his presentation by saying that the National Library of Latvia was grateful and proud to have been the first recipient of the EKN Grant.

MH went on to announce the Erland Kolding Nielsen grant awards for 2018. Five applications were received and MH thanked all who are applied. The two successful grants applications had been submitted by the National Library of Estonia for their international conference “Imagine a National Library” to be held in October 2018; and by the National Library of Serbia for an international workshop as part of the SEENL Conference in October 2018. The aim is to share knowledge and practice on digitisation, digital collection management and digital preservation.

MH called for applications for the next grant round in 2019. The budget for 2019 has been increased to €15,000 which means that 3 grants of €5,000 can be awarded. The Secretariat will call for applications in early 2019 with the closing date at the end of March. The successful awardees will be announced at the CENL AGM 2019 in Norway.

MH introduced six skills and knowledge exchange bursaries awarded so far. Each bursary is for a maximum of €1,000 and enables a staff member from a CENL member institution to travel to another member institution to learn and exchange knowledge and information. A budget of €30,000 was set aside for this scheme in 2017 and as we know from the treasurers’ report this has not all be spent. However, we are pleased to report that the number of applications is increasing. A further 7 applications have been approved for exchanges in 2018, and reports and photographs from these exchanges will be loaded up on the CENL website.

RK said that it was inspirational to see what other CENL members are doing, and the grant and bursary scheme was an excellent way to ensure that our staff got to know each other through CENL.

21. The CENL Community – Papers 12 and 13

CB introduced her presentation which focussed on the different ways in which CENL can operate as a community. The CENL Annual General Meeting (AGM) tends to be the focal point of the year and the photographs taken at these meetings are a very good record and go back to the beginnings of CENL.

But CENL is not just the AGM and its working groups and activities happen throughout the year. It is worth reflecting on how we communicate and continue to support each other throughout the year. CB reminded members of CENL’s Vision from the new strategy which is underpinned by CENL’s aim to be strong professional community with shared values of collaboration and partnership. We are always looking at old and new ways of working together.

CB reminded the members of how important the CENL website can be as a source of sharing information, and it was interesting to hear members’ thoughts on how we can use the website more effectively, and how we can better share knowledge. Within the website members have access to a range of applications forms for grants and bursaries, and can read reports from the skills exchange schemes. Using these can spark ideas for further collaboration. We can all use the website to make connections.

The CENL mailing list is another way in which we communicate. The Secretariat maintains this list and communications go to directors and other nominated parties. It is our main channel of communication at present so it is important to keep this information up-to-date.

CB summarised the question she posed (as Chief Librarian of the British Library, rather than as CENL Treasurer) to the membership about legal deposit legislation and harvested websites. 18 responses were received from across the membership and CB thanked members for their input. The full responses are in the conference papers. An interesting observation CB made was that the vast majority of libraries have access only onsite within their library buildings and it was valuable to see that the UK is not the only country having this debate, but that other countries are looking into similar questions, such as Germany.

SC added her thanks to CENL colleagues who contributed to the debate in Ireland and said that it had a real impact when the issue was discussed with her ministry. Although the National Library of Ireland's response referred to anticipated progress in late 2017, this is ongoing.

Another question distributed to all CENL members through the Secretariat was about the role of national libraries in supporting research. This referred to open access content and a number of interesting and useful responses were received. There may be a link to CENL's spaces theme, particularly about spaces used specifically to support the research community (e.g. meeting spaces).

National libraries are investing a lot in research infrastructure, e.g. by making available academic theses. This infrastructure also extends to text and data mining in support of digital humanities. Increasingly the national libraries themselves are important research collaboration partners. The BL, for instance, is just announcing a collaborative PhD with the University of Sheffield about research in national libraries, something which it will report back to CENL members about.

CB also referred to the survey question recently asked by the BnF. She asked all CENL members to consider using the CENL community in this way to inform their own work.

22. Any Other Business

No other business was recorded.

ISS announced that the host of the CENL AGM in 2020 will be the Royal Library in Belgium and congratulated SL and her team. RK thanked all the libraries who had applied to host in 2020 (Estonia and Luxembourg) but regretted there could only be one location.

ISS thanked all colleagues for attending the 2018 AGM in Iceland and also passed her thanks to the CENL Executive Committee and the Secretariat for their help in organising the conference.

RK offered thanks to ISS for hosting such a wonderful meeting and offered a small gift on behalf of all CENL members.

KE offered thanks to RK for chairing the meeting.

RK closed the meeting at 12.20 and CENL members adjourned for lunch and a tour of the NULI.