

Members Council Meeting 22-23 February 2016
Statens Museum for Kunst, Sølvgade 48-50, Copenhagen

MINUTES

Attendees Vladimir Alexiev (VA), Stephan Bartholmei (SB), Emmanuelle Bermès (EB), Laura Carletti (LC), Wim van Dongen (WD), Ellen Euler (EE), Gill Hamilton (GH 23/02 only), Kerstin Herlt (KH), Jana Hoffmann (JH), Lizzy Jongma (LJ), Max Kaiser (MK *Chair*), Paul Keller (PK *Treasurer*), Breandán Knowlton (BK), Rolf Källman (RK *Board Member*), Aranzazu Lafuente Urién (ALU), Jef Malliet (JM), Marco de Niet (MdN), Johan Oomen (JO *Board Member*), Merete Sanderhoff (MS *Vice-Chair*), Olivier Schulbaum (OS *until 23/02 14:00 CET*), Sorina Stanca (SS)

Invited experts Hana Doležalová (HD *National Museum, Prague*)

Europeana Office Jill Cousins (JC), Aubéry Escande (AE), Ylva Klaassen (YK), Gina van der Linden (GvL), Harry Verwayen (HV)

Apologies René Capovin (RCP), Reyes Carrasco (RCR), Francesca Di Donato (FD), Louise Edwards (LE), Jiří Frank (JF), Jonathan Gray (JG), Joke van der Leeuw-Roord (JLR *Board Member*), Sašo Zagoranski (SZ), Uldis Zariņš (UZ)

MK opened the meeting on Monday 22/02/2016 13:51 CET and welcomed everyone; the new Councillors briefly introduced themselves. The aim of this meeting was to briefly recap on the Association's activities in 2015, review the role of the Association in 2016 against the BP 2016 and to project the role of the Association in the context of Europeana Strategy 2015-2020. MK went over the activities of the last months: the AGM and follow-up to it, the elections (which resulted in 7 new Councillors being elected), the review of the election process and other governance aspects, the collaboration with the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science under the Dutch Presidency, the development of the #AllezCulture campaign and all the work done by TFs and WGs. The Association has also continued to grow: we currently have 1,380 members (updated figure 2 March 2016).

1. The Role of the Members Council

AE introduced the Councillors' role, timeline, and communications

- The Association was set up to increase the transparency of Europeana and the engagement of its network. Information on Councillors' roles and communications can be found in the 2016 Members Council Activity Plan.
- Councillors play an important role in promoting Europeana and the Association, within their own organisation but also at conferences and events. [Europeana Pro](#) provides templates for presentations as well as useful facts and figures. Another way to expand the reach of the Association is to involve their own networks, such as IFLA, ACE or ICOM – the 'Network of Networks' strategy. Councillors are asked to populate this form so we can investigate the reach of the Association, and keep updated on occasions where Councillors are speaking about Europeana.
- The Association, MC and MB are supported by the Network, Events & Sustainability Team at Europeana, consisting of AE (Manager), YK (Network Coordinator), GvL (Events Coordinator, responsible for TFs and the Association budget) and Tamara van Hulst (Assistant).

¹ MC: Members Council, MB: Management Board, TF: Task Force, WG: Working Group, BC: Basecamp, BP: Business Plan, EC: European Commission, MS: EU Member States.

→ **ACTION 1:** Europeana Network Team to chase Councillors to populate the network reach form.

2. Introduction to Europeana's 2016 Business Plan

HV congratulated the MC on being the largest network of cultural heritage professionals in the world. More important than size, however, is increasing the Association's influence in the sector. Europeana and the Association strive for this through the four main goals in [Europeana's 2016 Business Plan](#).

- **SB** asked who Europeana compares itself to when assessing performance in fields such as customer experience. If you compare yourself to big platforms like Google, Facebook, or Uber, who do a lot of user research, you will always come out worse. **HV** replied that Europeana does not have the means to do user and impact research on the same scale as these companies, but that it aims to integrate this increasingly into the work(flows). A miniproject on impact validation will be run in March-June 2016, with more research to follow if the pilot is successful. **MdN** proposed that [IMDb](#), the Internet Movie Database, could provide an interesting comparison, as they also have websites for both end-users and [professionals](#). **HV** proposed to set up a new TF to work on benchmarking (see under 6.1).

→ **ACTION 2:** MC to familiarise itself with the new Business Plan

→ **ACTION 3:** Europeana Office to send more background information (e.g. Statutes, Bylaws) to the new Councillors.

3. Dutch Presidency Council Conclusions

JC informed the MC on the background and purpose of the Council Conclusions, as well as on the work done to date and the contribution which the MC can make.

- **Background:** Under the Dutch Presidency of the Council of the European Union, the Dutch Ministry for Education, Culture and Science (OCW) has put the topic of digital cultural heritage prominently on the agenda of the [Education, Youth, Culture and Sports Council configuration](#) (EYCS). Particular attention goes to the infrastructure/platforms needed for digital cultural heritage, and Europeana is an important part of this topic.
- **Purpose:** The discussions on this topic within the Council configuration will lead to a set of [Council Conclusions](#), a position paper which is not legally binding, but very influential in inviting the EC and MS to take certain actions.

4. #AllezCulture Campaign

MS introduced the ideas for a renewed #AllezCulture campaign; more info in the campaign brief.

- Alongside our efforts to influence the content of the Council Conclusions, a campaign is being developed to increase interest and support for Europeana among the EU Ministers of Culture, the EC and the MS, as well as one targeted section of the general public (education).
- The purpose is to convince people that Europeana is worth funding in the medium and long term, and to make sure Ministers vote for Conclusions favourable to Europeana.
- The campaign is intended to be brief (March-May) and positive; Councillors would be using social media to create a buzz around the value of cultural diversity, the importance of cultural heritage and of access to it, the importance of culture to understand each other and connect people – and hence the continued relevance of Europeana's work.
- The social media posts are meant to convey two messages: 1) to draw attention to the richness of Europeana Collections; 2) to relate the issues Europe is facing today to content in Europeana, thus highlighting the continued relevance of culture and heritage.

- The campaign revives the [previous #AllezCulture campaign](#) and is coordinated by a WG led by MS in the MC. We will need the support of all Councillors to participate and encourage their own networks to join.
- Today the MC will work in groups to test the proposed campaign according to the guidelines. Based on their input, the campaign plan will be adjusted and presented to the MC for feedback, and then a communications plan will be developed.

The MC then worked in pairs to send out test tweets and provide their feedback. A smaller #AllezCulture subgroup (MS + OS, LC, HD, GH, LJ, ALU, SS, GL, YK) also looked into providing more specific feedback, which will be taken into account when revising the campaign brief.

- **The MC** was enthusiastic about the campaign's plan (option 1) of promoting the diversity of Europeana Collections by sharing your favourite items on social media. They perceived some more difficulties with option 2 (linking current to past migration) and proposed asking particular individuals for participation rather than making it an open call.
- **MdN** asked for more clarity regarding the mandate of the WG, the reasons for starting the campaign, the desired outcomes, and the relationship with the MC. **JC** agreed that the mandate should be made clearer, and asked all Councillors to go through the campaign brief.
- **PK** argued that this campaign should not be conducted by the MC, but by communications professionals at Europeana and in the network, as Councillors are not comms specialists. **SB** agreed that the instructions need to be more specific if everyone should be able to join. **MS** replied that it is important that everybody can participate in the campaign, since we want to raise the support of users and the whole network for this. She agreed that adjustments are necessary to make it simpler, and said that the Europeana Office Communications team, as well as the network's Communicators Group, will be involved in further development of the campaign. Europeana Office would take the lead in creating templates and starting off the campaign at the beginning of each week. **LC** added that a user-centric thought is very important: we need to make participating fun for the public.
- **EB** asked how the WG planned to measure the impact of the campaign. **JC** proposed looking at social media activity, e.g. number of tweets with the #AllezCulture hashtag, as well as press take-up.
- **SB** asked how the education target group would be reached. **JC** replied that the WG is working with EUROCLIO (JLR) to reach secondary school teachers and pupils. **MS** added that adult students may be targeted later on as well.

→ **ACTION 8:** #AllezCulture WG to provide an updated campaign plan to the MC after the meeting

→ **ACTION 9:** All Councillors to participate in the campaign and involve their networks

5. Association Budget

PK presented a budget update; see his presentation for the full figures.

- It's important to note that the Association does not have its own budget; it receives money from Europeana Foundation. This means that if, for some reason, Europeana stops funding the Association (for instance, because it is not funded by the EC as a Core Service), the Association has no specific funding. Changes in funding structures can impact the Association's finances, and membership fees must be kept in mind as an option for the future.
- The Association budget as approved at the AGM 2015 is as follows:

Income	€ 55,000
DSI-1 (must be spent before 31/05/2016)	€ 20,000
DSI-2	€ 35,000
Expenses	€ 55,000
Travel costs (2 Members Council meetings)	€ 22,500
Other costs (Elections, etc.)	€ 2,500

Task Forces (4 Task Forces x € 7,500)	€ 30,000
---------------------------------------	----------

- The two MC meetings are this one and the next; the third one before the AGM will be covered by the AGM budget. The estimated travel costs for the MC are probably a bit too high.
- There is money for 4 TFs, but the MC has already received 5 proposals this year, and two ongoing TFs still need to have a meeting in 2016. **AE** remarked that some TFs (often the technical ones) do not need a budget because they do all their meetings virtually. This means that there will probably be enough money to cover all approved TFs this year.
- As the DSI-1 money has to be spent before the end of May, all TFs should be encouraged to have their first meeting before that.

→ **ACTION 10:** GvL to encourage all TFs to have their first meeting before mid-May

6. Task Forces and Working Groups

6.1. Task Forces

AE presented an introduction to and update on the TFs; see also the Task Force overview.

- **Goal:** [Task Forces \(TFs\)](#) are set up by the Association to investigate or tackle specific subjects or areas of common interest to the digital heritage field and Europeana's strategy.
- **Initiative:** Task Forces are proposed and chaired by a member of the Association
- **Membership:** Membership is open to all Association members, with a maximum of 10 members, including 1 Councillor, 1 Europeana Staff member, and 2 open seats for other Association members, to be filled through an open call.
- **Output:** The outcome of every TF should be a set of recommendations that can contribute to the development of the Europeana Foundation Business Plan for the next year. The recommendations will be published on Europeana Pro (see the [outcomes of past TFs](#) and [this blog post](#)). TFs are also required to submit a [mid-term report](#), and a representative of the TF will be asked to attend the AGM to report on the results.
- **Timeframe:** They run for a limited period of time (usually 6 to 9 months). The TFs approved now must deliver a mid-term report by May; their recommendations are due by the AGM.
- **Budget:** TFs receive money for 2 physical meetings and are asked to try and keep the costs to a minimum. On average a TF physical meeting costs around € 2,500.
- **Communications:** TF use BC as their platform for communication
- **Setting up a TF:** To set up a new TF, the Chair submits a proposal for consideration to the MC [using this form](#); the proposal is then circulated to the MC for review (often on BC), after which feedback is provided to the Chair. The revised proposal is then accepted/rejected by the MC, and the 2 open seats are advertised to the Association. The TFs operate under the supervision of the MC, coordinated by GvL in the Office
- **ToR:** New TF Terms of Reference (ToR) are currently being drafted and will be presented to the MC for review and approval after this meeting. An important change is that the MC should become more involved in the process, e.g. by peer reviewing the recommendations. We have six finished TFs from last year, as well as two ongoing ones that will deliver recommendations before June 2016. All these recommendations need to be reviewed; a call will go out to the MC about this soon.

→ **ACTION 11:** GvL to get back to the Chairs of the proposed TF about the decisions of the MC + update the TF overview

→ **ACTION 12:** MdN to submit a TF proposal for review

→ **ACTION 13:** Europeana Office to circulate a call for the peer review of TF recommendations, to be completed before the next MC meeting

→ **ACTION 14:** new ToR to be circulated and approved

6.2. Working Groups

AE presented an introduction to and update on the WGs; see also the [Working Group overview](#).

- **Initiative:** WGs are proposed and led by a member of the MC
- **WG constituents:** representation is by invite only (but not restricted to Councillors: they can include external experts); all members must be Association members
- **Goal:** WGs address issues of general, continuing or recurrent relevance, and are therefore not related to the Europeana Foundation Business Plans
- **Output:** WGs do not have to deliver a specific outcome (such as recommendations)
- **Timeframe:** There is no fixed timeframe for WGs; they can remain in existence as long as there is a need for them
- **Budget:** There is no structural budget available for WGs, but requests for money can be made to the MB.
- **Setting up a WG:** To set up a new WG, a Councillor submits a proposal for consideration; the proposal is then reviewed and accepted/rejected by the MC.
- **ToR:** The WG [Terms of Reference](#) will be reviewed later this year.

AE then presented the six WG proposals that were submitted before this meeting; many of them are already running. The MC representatives for each WG briefly explained the purpose of the WG.

- [#AllezCulture](#) (MC representative: MS): see above (under 4) for more information.
- [Voting/Elections](#) (JLR, RK): this WG will sort out the last 'open ends' in the Association governance and function as the Voting Committee for the next elections. The outcomes will be presented at the next MC meeting or at the latest 1 September 2016. Two more members are needed, as JLR, RK and JM might want to stand for re-election and therefore cannot be part of the Voting Committee. **LC and EB** joined the WG.
- [AGM](#) (JO, UZ): working on organising the next AGM in Riga, November 2016.
- [Copyright Policy](#) (PK): already running, set up following the MC meeting in July 2015.
- [Data Quality](#) (JM, LJ): several TFs have dealt with aspects of data quality in the past; this WG is set up as a longer-term coordinator of this issue. The 37 members of the WG will work on different topics. **VA** expressed his concern about the moderation of such a large group and pointed out that some decisions in the potential scope of this WG are as much political as they are technical - this should be taken into account when making decisions. **HV** asked the WG to take the Europeana Publishing Framework as a reference for their work, to link it to the content strategy to be developed by Europeana this year. **MdN** asked how feedback from the WG is taken into account by Europeana; **JC** replied that the link between the two should be made by the Europeana Staff member on the WG, and that it would be good to have better mechanisms for providing feedback, but that in the end the Europeana Office has to decide on the work to be done, as it needs to deliver against the DSI DoA in order to receive funding. **LJ** emphasised that the WG also provides an opportunity for members to learn from each other; **SB** added that, following the successful case of DDB WGs, Europeana would benefit from being more proactive in asking feedback from its WGs. **VA and JH** volunteered to join the WG.
- [Europeana Pro](#) (AE, several Councillors): this WG will work with the Editorial Team to improve the way Europeana Pro serves its various target communities.
- A new Communicators Group of about twenty comms professionals will be set up by KH following the recommendations of the Communicators TF. This Group is to be distinguished from the Communicators Forum who mainly push out information. Four more members are needed, preferably from the technology sector, the creative industry, education and research; Councillors are asked to get in touch with KH if they know suitable candidates who are comms specialists in their own fields.

All WGs were approved by the MC. **YK** indicated that all Councillors should ideally be involved in at least one WG; the Office will get in touch with those who are not yet in one WG to ask which they would like to join.

→ **ACTION 15:** YK to get back to the Chairs of the proposed WG about the decisions of the MC and new members + update the WG overview

- **ACTION 16:** YK to ask the Councillors not on a WG yet which they would like to join
- **ACTION 17:** Councillors to get in touch with KH about candidates for the Communicators Group

*The slots on the Europeana Strategy and the Association's contribution to that were moved to the next meeting for reasons of timing. **MK** wrapped up by thanking everyone for their participation in this productive meeting, and **MS** in particular for hosting us at SMK. All presentations will be circulated on BC. The next meeting will be in June (location and dates to be confirmed); important topics then will be the MC's input for Europeana's Business Plan 2017 and the 2016 elections. The meeting was closed on Tuesday 23/02/2016 at 14:56 CET.*

A selection of these minutes will be made available on Europeana Pro to support the MC transparency towards the Association; however, the TF decision process and Council Conclusion preparation will not be public.