Europeana Network Association Management Board

MB Meeting 15 October 2019, 15:00 -16:00 CET

https://app.gotomeeting.com/home.html
Access Code: 923-231-453

MINUTES

Attendees Marco de Niet (MdN, Chair), Georgia Angelaki (GA), Fred Truyen (FT), Erwin Verbruggen (EV), Merete Sanderhoff (MS), Harry Verwayen (HV), Zuzana Malicherova (ZM)

Apologies Sara Di Giorgio (SdG), Stephan Bartholmei (SB)

Actions

➔ **Action 2019-recurring: ZM - to share the minutes of the previous and this MB meeting with the MC and on Pro, and update the list of actions on Basecamp (done).**
➔ **Action 2019-46: MB - to give feedback to MS by commenting in the feedback document as soon as possible, latest by 21 October 2019.**
➔ **Action 2019-47: MB - to review the minutes on Basecamp.**
➔ **Action 2019-48: ZM & MdN - to draft methodology for the MC meeting sessions.**
➔ **Action 2019-49: ZM - to draft the 2019 annual report and 2020 activity plan, MB to review and add input to the reports by 1 November.**

1. Input of the Board to the recommendations of the DCHE Subgroup on Strategy 2020-20

MS, HV and present Board members discussed the new Europeana Strategy in preparation for the next DCHE Sub-group meeting. This conversation was meant to provide MS with input on behalf of ENA. The Strategy is currently in the final preparatory phase. Representatives of the DCHE have brought recommendations back to their ministries to consult how Europeana should support the CHIs in their digital transformation. The ongoing discussions, led by the EC, have also involved the EF (EF got involved midway through the process) and the EAF, and by now it seems that all the parties have found common grounds for agreement.

The Sub-group members have divided the recommendations among themselves, each collecting feedback relevant to them. The end product of these recommendations might be 15-20 pages long. The substance of the recommendations might not change too much anymore and once the final outcome is in, it will form the content of the actual Strategy. Then the EF will take over and create a shorter and user friendly Strategy document. The internal deadline of the Sub-group for incorporating the feedback is 21 October, then the Sub-group meeting will take place on 28 October. MS prepared the following questions that she wished to discuss with the Board members:

1) The new strategy focuses on Europeana facilitating a digital transformation for the main target users: CHI's. What are the strongest arguments to convince Member States that their CHI's need to achieve such a digital transformation? What's in it for them? What will they lose if they don't achieve it?

EV suggested that we need to formulate to bigger extent what Europeana is strong at, the final strategy should specify the impact of digital transformation and include a political dimension - arguments that are convincing for the member states. Europeana can play an important role 'behind the scenes' by encouraging and inspiring professionals to take action. On one hand, the focus should be on practical aspects - building shared metadata structures, IPR policies etc - on the other hand, Europeana should use its soft power in individual empowerment and community building.

MS enquired whether Europeana should focus on guidance or on facilitation of the digital transformation. It was discussed that Europeana can be actively involved in various dimensions of digital transformation, but the MB agrees that Europeana should keep a focus on what it is already good at: international crossdomain collaboration. Europeana is capable of doing more than it currently offers, e.g. for individual institutions, but it should also make use of the ENA to achieve this. FT proposes to start from what Europeana can offer and endorse its role towards the CHIs, acting as a mission multiplier, rather than directly reaching undefined end users. Europeana doesn't directly help the CHIs with how they run their business, it rather supports them with technological development, training, and by allowing professionals working there to connect and reach out to new audiences. This is also where Europeana's impact should be measured.

2) How can Europeana relate to national strategies for a sustainable digital cultural heritage playing field?
3) How can we describe a more global ambition for Europeana in the next strategic period (the practical, moral and ethical aspects of digitising and disseminating CH that originate in countries and cultures outside Europe) that we can realistically manage to carry out?

Europeana should continue its advocacy efforts and try to influence the member states in harmonizing the national strategies by building on its key mission, experience, expertise, professional competencies and strength of the ENA. GA pointed to the fact that member states and CHIs that lack progressive policies are easily left behind, which is an issue that should be stressed out. The 'outlier' CHIs should also benefit from the work of Europeana, therefore it would be useful to find a way to frame those benefits. Europeana should keep the multiplier effect and not only focus on stronger CHIs, but to impact different user groups.

4) Which three things are most important for Europeana to achieve in the next strategic period - prioritized by importance and on a timeline (short-medium-long term) ?

MdN: 1) visibility and reusability of the digital collections, 2) soft power (knowledge and vision), 3) moving forward (innovation).
FT: 1) Showing that we are a real community of professionals and also CHIs, keep developing the ENA communities and showing their impact, 2) showing visible impact of Europeana's efforts in research and education, 3) Common Culture as an example of good balance of collaboration between the ENA and national aggregators.
GA: Achieving greater collaboration with CHIs in terms of policy and decision making, and greater support of/by member states.
GA created a feedback document where she provided her feedback. The rest of the Board members can also use it to comment and provide further input.

→ **Action 2019-46:** MB - to give feedback to MS by commenting in the feedback document as soon as possible, latest by 21 October 2019.

2. Review of minutes and pending actions from MB meeting 11 September and 27 September 2019

→ **Action 2019-47:** MB - to review the minutes on Basecamp.

3. MC meeting agenda

The Board went through the MC meeting agenda points in an effort to finalize it. EV will finalize and present the CoC and ask the Council for formal approval. It will be the first time to discuss the topic of digital transformation of the cultural heritage sector so the methodology for this session needs to be thought through in order to have some tangible outcomes (possibly a statement). Ideally, the MC should come up with a strategy on how the Councillors and their work can support EF in the process of digital transformation. The session of communities should result in concrete proposals for actions in 2020. The community work plans should have a common format and the implementation process should be streamlined but it shouldn't cause too much administrative burden.

→ **Action 2019-48:** ZM & MdN - to draft methodology for the MC meeting sessions.

4. Europeana 2019 and General Assembly preparation

- *Final programme and preparation of documents*

The event is completely sold out but there will be live streaming available. The programme has been finalized and will be published in the coming days.

→ **Action 2019-49:** ZM - to draft the 2019 annual report and 2020 activity plan, MB to review and add input to the reports by 1 November.

5. Recurrent agenda items

- *Governance update / approval of new membership requests*

Mdn agreed to join SB in the monthly review membership requests.

- *New TF proposal (tbc)*

Impact community agreed to adopt the TF proposal addressing a 'new professionals' programme. Once the SG is in agreement with a formal proposal, the Board will review it.

6. AOB

The next meeting will take place on 4 November at 15:00.

- _Update on Time Machine_

The Time Machine has by now become an association of its own, with HV being on its Board. It has come up with three types of members: founding (Europeana, paying 10 000 Euros), organisational or individual (with voting rights), and associate (receiving information but no voting rights). The project as such is very similar to what Europeana has been doing, although while Europeana's role remains indisputable as a leader in cultural heritage field, the Time Machine is more focused on computer science (smart cities, AI, machine reading etc.) and works towards a goal with a 10-year time frame. That has led EF to start working on a memorandum of understanding which can specify how the two organisations complement and understand each other.

HV asked the MB to think strategically about how Europana should be positioned towards the Time Machine and where the ENA should stand in this equation. Do we want to encourage ENA members to also join the Time Machine? It would be good to clarify the Time Machine goals and membership benefits to the ENA members to avoid any confusion, and encourage them to be part of both associations, but HV and the MB should discuss on what terms this should happen. HV will work on the draft memorandum and share it with the MB for further input prior to the next call.