Europeana Network Association
Members Council

Members Council Meeting 7 November 2016
National Library Of Latvia, Riga

MINUTES
[AGENDA](#)

Attending Councillors

Max Kaiser (MK Chair), Merete Sanderhoff (MS Vice-Chair), Paul Keller (PK Treasurer), Rolf Källman (RK Board Member), Joke van der Leeuw-Roord (JLR Board Member), Johan Oomen (JO Board Member), Vladimir Alexiev (VA), Stephan Bartholmei (SB), Emmanuelle Bermès (EB), Laura Carletti (LC), Francesca Di Donato (FD), Wim van Dongen (WD), Ellen Euler (EE), Gill Hamilton (GH), Kerstin Herlt (KH), Lizzy Jongma (LJ), Jef Malliet (JM), Marco de Niet (MdN), Olivier Schulbaum (OS), Sorina Stanca (SS), Marcin Werla (MW), Uldis Zarins (UZ)

Europeana office

Jill Cousins (JC), Harry Verwayen (HV), Aubéry Escande (AE), Shadi Ardalan (SA), Gina van der Linden (GvdL)

Apologies

Reyes Carrasco (RC), Jirí Frank (JF), Jana Hoffmann (JH), Breandán Knowlton (BK), Aránzazu Lafuente Urién (ALU), Saso Zagoranski (SZ), René Capovin (RC)

<u>Welcome, apologies, setting the scene</u>

MK opened the meeting at 9:30 CET, welcomed the Councillors and briefly introduced the topics on the agenda. Discussions revolve around Europeana refined strategy in relation to May 2016 Council Conclusions; Europeana Network Association (hereinafter ENA) in Europeana ecosystem, relationship and money; ENA vision and mission; open mike session; reflection and lessons learnt as very essence of moving forward; taskforces and working groups; thematic collections under CEF call; Members Council (hereinafter MC) elections - voting and wrap up followed by dinner in downtown Riga.

I.   <u>Minutes of last meeting, and actions pending</u>

From the minutes of MC meeting 21-22 June 2016, two points were updated / clarified: 1) Smartcity taskforce will be submitted following the MC meeting after a compromise is reached. 2) Second round of *#AllezCulture* campaign will be revived in the course of 2017 rather than now.

II.   **Europeana new strategic positioning**

[Background Paper](#)
[JC 's presentation](#)

[May](#) [2016](#) [Council](#) [Conclusions](#) concluded that [Europeana](#) [2020](#) [Strategy](#) is fundamentally in the right path yet it has to be more explicit and sharpened in some cases, have a modernised approach to users and be endorsed by all stakeholders. JC summarised the history of the preparatory work to identify the pain points[1] and the game changers[2] as well as the consultations by the Governing Board's MS and CHIs working groups to date to examine whether the refinement is sensible as far as MS and CHIs are concerned. Here in Riga Europeana will try to canvass more feedback from the AGM participants. Reactions from Member States so far are around Europeana showing why it is good for CHIs to shift to the direction of proposed strategy and ways of communicating where the reward is laid, modernising the way we reach out to end users and extending the B2B partnerships. The responsibilities are divided: partnership development by Europeana, data by aggregators and CHIs, audience development and outreach by education, research and creative industries. Europeana's reach is much stronger where users have already been engaged, aiming professionals via partnerships and continuing through social media and Wikipedia. This doesn't mean we are losing what is known to be the portal. It will continue to exist. We continue to reach end users through thematic collections and thematic campaigns. Business Plan 2017 top lines will be presented on day 1 of AGM.

The Councillors find the proposed strategy refinement going in the right direction with some comments for consideration. SB and FD are opposed to / not convinced respectively, while all others are broadly in favour of the proposal. The criticisms and suggestions included the following which were not answered by Europeana Foundation, just taken as commentary:

● Successful platforms know a lot about their users, Europeana doesn't. It relies on data partners for user data which means losing data. Giving up on the end user prematurely is seen to be a mistake. Knowing users better, real usage and usage of data back is important. Europeana should conduct user data analysis and the content should follow the user. Research on what users want is important. Comparing what users don't find with what they find, the analysis thereof and showing the results can be helpful.

---

[1] *Three identified pain points are: i) the portal is not what the users want; ii) CHIs getting data into Europeana and getting a reward for it, more difficult when there is no funding for it. iii) lack of clarity in the roles and responsibilities.*
[2] *Game changer 1: invest in making it insanely easy and rewarding for CHIs to publish with Europeana; Game changer 2: introduce a more contemporary approach to reach end users.*

- More awareness needs to be raised around the rewarding side of the shift in the direction of the proposed strategy for CHIs and the increased impact as driving force with supporting statistics and tangible examples of rewards. The value of what Europeana does for CHIs should be conveyed in a couple of messages stressing why it's good for CHIs to publish quality data with Europeana. The value proposition of easy publishing has to be made explicit for both the aggregators and the Member States.
- Value of Europeana should be expressly made known to institutions who focus only on reporting high traffic in their portals to their respective ministries. The strategy requires that MS change what they expect from CHIs.
- The selling point of the refined strategy is in establishing a new matrix to attract users to institutions' domains through Europeana as a hub with recreational value. Europeana should not be measured only by portal, but also through Wikipedia and social media.
- Speaking of data providers, much of heritage we are dealing with comes from small associations, heritage is not solely in cultural heritage institutions. Cultural heritage communities might be better than CHIs.
- Data providers may not be interested in, capable of or willing to put extra effort in data quality. There, Europeana should work on engagement and trust.
- Crafting the quality of data submission is difficult. Placing the data quality responsibility on institutions could lead to loss in quality and would undermine the data selection strategy. Europeana should continue to encourage good quality but also not admit poor data. Quality should include metadata.
- Through creation of collections and big annual campaigns, the reward of getting material out for institutions can be brought to the fore. Theme strategy should stimulate digitisation.
- Trusted source is not apparent in the diagramme.
- Thematic collections do not work for search. We can understand user behaviour but we don't know what they want.
- Active collection management based on user research, identifying, negotiating with CHIs actively and curating not only the content but also the type of material based on the demand are important considerations
- A campaign theme such as "migration" is controversial. Europeana cannot satisfy all users' needs, though. The content and quality of the stories that emerge under the campaign should be showcased. Here lies the opportunity to think in terms of community-building and experience-sharing, with actual migrant communities, in order to shed contemporary light on the heritage of migration.
- Shift in emphasis so less B2C more B2B.
- The term " insanely easy" had better be replaced by "easy" or be carefully used.
- "Insanely easy" in Operation Direct focuses on easiness rather than quality. Relation between ease and quality should be clarified. Quality aspect should be emphasised.
- Under Game Changer 1 organisational shift, the wording of "large expenditure of DSI budget on domain aggregators" implies waste of funds, while it's spending on a major change. Domain aggregation is fundamental and should be presented as working progress.

Most of the paper was written in September since which we moved towards a much more hybrid model. Rewriting the revised strategy refinement, the work of working groups will be taken into consideration and reflected without losing the point of necessity of the shift.

● Given the poor quality of data in the education sector, Europeana should connect with ministries of education across Europe for standardisation. Education has the most potential but requires heavy curation.

● Dealing with too much content and specific users being in conflict with aggregating more data, the strategy refinement should reconcile these two key points (critical mass value).

● The strategy refinement proposal doesn't cover how Europeana is going to support the CHIs in digitisation and digital single market.

III   <u>Europeana ecosystem, relationship and the money</u>

MK's Presentation

Europeana is genuinely an ecosystem believing that culture matters and what we do together affects our world. With the aim to sufficiently inform the Councillors, JC presented a history of how Europeana evolved overtime since inception. As a whole the Europeana Ecosystem depends on external funding. European Commission's new model for funding Europeana ecosystem is through procurement with some implications for the entire ecosystem. The better the segments of teh Ecosystem work together, the stronger will we all become. Project monies belong to the entire Europeana ecosystem. Under DSI III, we have to make the infrastructure shared and more cost efficient. The DSI III money funds the ENA, the aggregation, the coordination in The Hague, BnF and BL. What changes here is that Europeana will be funded for a procured service. What doesn't change is it will be through a consortium of institutions. And what shouldn't change is the way we work together as a project.

Europeana is not only the organisation in The Hague, it is the whole ecosystem including ENA and the aggregators. The new governance structure gave ENA the opportunity to be very actively represented in the Foundation Board. Europeana is talking with different types of aggregators. The aggregation landscape is going to be a hybrid which should be supported by the DSIs in an effective and efficient manner.

ENA and the MC will discuss procurement scenarios high on the agenda in 2017 with the aim to secure the position of the Network and conclude the discussions by autumn, before the tender call.

Procurement
ENA and the MC will discuss various procurement scenarios with the aim to secure the position of the Network. Such discussions will start in 2017 and should come to conclusion by autumn, before the tender call.

➔ Decision 1: The whole discussion is theoretical based on very little known facts. By next autumn, ENA and the MC should hold discussions on procurement scenarios.

➔ Action 1: Europeana Office - To include procurement in the agenda of next MC meeting.

IV. <u>Association (interim) vision and mission statements</u>

Background paper
UZ's presentation

Vision
"We believe that open access to our cultural heritage will make Europe a more culturally connected, sustainable, tolerant and inclusive society, where European citizens reach their cultural, intellectual and entrepreneurial potential and contribute to smart and durable economic growth; building on the freely available digital collections of European cultural heritage institutions we can transform the world with culture."

Council Conclusions bring forth some shift in the role of each body. ENA never had its own vision and mission. A lot of uncertainty about vision and mission is tied with the procurement discussion. On one hand you want to keep it simple and concise, on the other hand you wish to cover everything. Today's discussion is aimed at reaching an agreement on the general direction.

- To see more of "we together" focus in it.
- The European citizens and what impact we are leaving on European citizens should be in the centre of vision.
- Terms "entrepreneurial"and "economic" accentuate the economic aspect - rather than philosophical - of what we do. To replace "economic" growth with "durable" growth.
- Remove culturally in make Europe more connected in the second line.
- This vision is rounded around the 18th century enlightenment eliteness rather than the modern European society.
- One opposed to changing this to adapt it to mainstream of political vision and desire.

➔ Decision 2: The Councillors unanimously agreed with recommendation of the Working Group that *"The Europeana Foundation and the Europeana Network Association share the same vision but each have a mission statement delineating their roles in fulfilling the vision."*

➔ Action 2: UZ - To take the vision statement up with the Working Group to incorporate the comments from this meeting, work with Europeana Foundation Board and bring the results back to next MC meeting in 2017, aiming to formally have the vision statement

Mission

"The mission of the Europeana Network Association is to participate in Europeana governance, strategy and policies; to drive cross-border and cross-domain cooperation; facilitate innovation in the digital cultural heritage community; develop and implement relevant frameworks, standards and best practices; promote the vision and the values of Europeana and encourage engagement with and use of Europeana by both cultural heritage and other sectors."

- As a mission statement, it's too long but good as a starting point.
- The statement lacks the reason why to participate in Europeana.
- To shift "**promote vision**" before "**participate in governance, strategy and policies**"
- It lacks cross border cooperation, Europeana as a tool to achieve cross border values of culture.
- Perhaps better to replace "sectors" with "stakeholders" so it's more inclusive and that citizens are included. Some may not find themselves represented in this statement as it's not in line with the mission of the institutions they come from.
- ENA deems there is no hierarchy between Europeana Foundation and ENA. It's about cultural heritage not about Europeana.
- While there is no distinction between the Foundation and ENA externally; however, there should be an understanding internally where the divisions are, where the ENA starts and ends, and where the Foundation starts and ends. This is sort of a job description for Association. It forms a baseline for the new members. For the outside world a concise slogan is needed.
- Terms vision and mission are statutory, repeatedly seen and heard. Instead call it "ambition" or phrase it in actionable terms, such as "what we aspire to" (vision) and "how we achieve it" (mission). What is it that we are aiming for? Change an attitude. What we want to change is missing from the statement.
- Diversity of representation is not covered.

➔ Decision 3: Reference to the second recommendation of the Working Group "*to approve the use of the draft versions of the vision and the mission statements in the interim",* and with some adjustments, the MB presents the major elements of both draft vision and mission statements to the AGM on 8 Nov., with the aim to recommend the components of the job description to Network members as a draft and a work in progress (rather than waiting until next AGM). It will also be posted on twitter and will go to the Foundation Board to see if it complements the job description of the Foundation.

V. **Open mike session**

Culture & cultural heritage

MdN - Heritage is more than collections. From 1st Jan 2017 ENA is supporting not only institutions but all in cultural sector. Culture and cultural heritage should be interchangeable and we should work in a more structured way. We should also define what we mean by culture. We say "we transform the world with culture", we don't say "with cultural heritage". The world of culture and cultural heritage are getting closer.

Are we trying to shift the perspective of the past? Do we have to invite artists and philosophers? Perhaps it's good to be added to the mission statement as a common understanding of what we mean by culture and cultural heritage.

➔ Action 3: Europeana Office - To add the subject as an item on the agenda of a future MC meeting.

Audiovisual in Europeana
JO - Audiovisual media ranges from audio to film and television. Since Feb 2016 the taskforce has been searching for three answers: 1) how to improve the use; 2) how to make the content more accessible; and 3) how to improve the editorial. The progress report of Audiovisual Media in Europeana Taskforce gives a set of recommendations. Two or more AV or non-AV volunteers amongst the Councillors are needed to review the recommendations with the aim to finalise the report by March 2017.

➔ SB, GH, KH volunteered. Final recommendations will be made available in Q1 2017.

International Image Interoperability Framework taskforce
MK - IIIF taskforce is high on the agenda. AE presented the TF objectives: set up a survey within the Network Association to call for members with IIIF experience and to identify how ENA relates to IIIF, and what role it can play. A general call to the network participation must be issued in the Network Newsletter once the TF has been approved.

➔ Action 4: Europeana Office - To circulate the IIIF TF proposal to the MC for approval and the call for participation in the IIIF TF once approved.
➔ Action 5: All Councillors - To spread the taskforce proposal call within own networks once the MC has approved it

Copyright reform advocacy mandate
PK - In the light of European Commission 's copyright proposal for a directive on Copyright in the Digital Single Market issued mid September 2016, the Foundation Board has asked a subgroup of the former ENA Copyright Working Group to update the copyright reform advocacy mandate. The subgroup is now analysing EC's proposal, and the questions whether Europeana should be or needs to take part in copyright activities. There is a draft mandate that outlines the issues we should deal with (e-lending, Marrakesh Treaty, fair compensation, term of protection, hyperlinking, protection of press publications, online platform) and the direction Europeana should take. The more people have looked at the draft mandate, the better so that the draft

mandate has been broadly consulted. The Councillors who may know people in their networks with interest in copyright, are invited to share the draft mandate within their networks also aiming to bring up the issues that are currently not on the table. The copyright subgroup will have to report back to the Foundation Board on 16 Nov, so any input before that will be useful. It will also be discussed in a panel at the AGM on 8 Nov. Regardless of being in agreement with copyright reform advocacy or not, the institutions are recognising the extraordinary work that has been done to bring a wide range of various views to the table.

➔ Action 6: PK - To share the draft mandate with MC on basecamp.

Award for outgoing Councillors
JO - suggested to acclaim the remarkable work of the outgoing councillors in some way.

➔ Action 7: Europeana Office - To open a list for nominations and ideas.

VI. **Looking back & looking forward: reflection and lessons learnt after two years of Association and Members Council & projecting the next steps**

Annual Report 2015-2016.
Activity Plan 2017
JLR's Presentation
AE's Presentation

The Members Council was established by ENA in 2014 to prioritise issues that Europeana addresses and set the agenda for the annual conference. In 2015, out of 1167 eligible network members, 603 participated in the elections. This year, 48 candidates came forth for 28 seats and 1523 members can vote. Some Councillors do not stand up again, due to time constraints. In 2015, there were 25 Councillors, 11 newsletters were issued and 36 blogs were posted on Pro. In 2016, 29 Councillors worked together, 9 newsletters were issued and 42 blogs were posted on Pro. As of 1st Nov., ENA has 1560 members, with over 3200 followers on linkedin. In the past two years, two annual general assemblies, 6 MC meetings and 21 MB meetings have been held. 10 taskforces and 8 working groups worked on various topics in 2015-2016. *#AllezCulture* campaign tweets during NL presidency reached some 1 M users. Reflecting on the role of Councillors, these include: engaging the members, connecting the members with the Foundation, communicating with members and other professional networks and representing the interest of their networks.

The Councillors broke out into three groups and discussed their experience as a member of MC whether positive or otherwise; what they think the objectives of the MC are; and, their message to pass over to incoming Councillors:

Positive

- achieved better understanding of Europeana,
- built a new structure together that now helps influence policy and has an impact on both institutions and outside,
- representation on Europeana Foundation Board,
- met people who share the same values,
- did useful work, and represented a bigger group at national level or a professional network,
- there is a lot of food for thought, it's exciting and lots of fun,
- opportunity to learn valuable lesson from a multitude of cultural heritage sector segments, policies and standards,
- work within MC dramatically improved because it takes time to get to know each other and be able to really collaborate efficiently - this is the main reason why the Councillors propose to expand MC period from 2 to 3 years.

Needs improvement
- The Councillors suggested some areas for improvement such as: being given sufficient time to update respective communities about Europeana, and support to keep pace with Europeana and the MC; less involvement in external, housekeeping, legal and governance issues; support to make connection between MC and the wider Network.

Role objectives of Councillors
- representing communities or voters in MC,
- being part of communication chain,
- stimulating and engaging ENA members,
- Connecting ENA members to the Foundation,
- coordinating and facilitating dialogue,
- contributing to influencing European cultural policy,
- introducing ideas that could end up in decision making process,
- raising debate internally on issues that matter,
- influencing European cultural policies,
- advocating value of Europeana externally.

Suggestions and message to the new Council
- to set up a physical meeting for the new MC ASAP,
- if increased to 50 Councillors, MC will have to break out and work in smaller groups to remain agile,
- meetings should have more emphasis on Councillors bringing messages from respective communities and taking feedback from MC,
- more tools to get people involved and to get respective networks engaged,
- talk to own community and share the experience,
- reality check: as a councillor you are working on the household. You work on another level for your network which is broader than your own community. Not always will you bring a message from your community,

- Consider the time it requires and ensure support from your organisation to invest time in the work with MC,
- you can influence your organisation and eventually the cultural heritage sector through the work with the MC and with a pan-European community behind you.

➜ Action 8: Europeana Office - To set up a physical meeting for the new MC ASAP.

Activity plan 2017
Quarter 1: MB elections and meetings, 1st MC meeting, meet your councillors on Pro, taskforces approval, AV Taskforce final recommendations, plenary preparation, vision and mission, support for Maltese presidency event, new *#AllezCulture* campaign and revamp of Pro.
Quarter 2: MB meeting, MC meeting, meet your councillors on Pro, taskforces approval, plenary preparation, vision and mission, support for Maltese presidency event, new *#AllezCulture* campaign and prep for 2017 elections.
Quarter 3: MB meetings, meet your councillors on Pro, taskforces interim reports, preparation for 2017 General Assembly meeting, plenary preparation, support for Estonian presidency event, launch of 2017 elections and call for new taskforces.
Quarter 4: MB meetings, 3rd MC meeting (Budget 2017 is provisional, the third physical meeting might be skipped due to lack of budget.), meet your councillors on Pro, taskforces final reports, 2017 General Assembly in which Association's vision and mission to be ratified, plenary (with more focus on all the sectors speaking to us while AGM is about network speaking to the network), support for Estonian presidency event, 2017 elections.

VII. Task Forces & Working groups: ideas for the set-up of new groups (incl. on aggregators' position, libraries and benchmarking)

JM/SB on aggregators
JM's Presentation

Better definition, rules and set boundaries are required for aggregators. The existing definitions and rules were created long time ago and are obsolete now. A taskforce is proposed to fix the boundaries and work out the participation framework. As elements of participation framework, we have taskforces and working groups. Perhaps we also need a committee as a sub-group of MC, or a forum as a group of stakeholders with common interest, or through projects where there is direct collaboration with the Foundation. The idea was circulated at the October 2016 Aggregator Forum. Aggregators want a voice in governance of Europeana and to exchange experience, build consensus, provide advice, and participate in strategy formulation. Participation in Governance is through ENA and MC but aggregators are a group of institutions and the Association is a group of persons. Aggregators have the Aggregator Forum but it's not sufficient, they are represented in the MC but not formally, they have diverging interests and they participate in DSI projects. SB and JM suggest a preparatory taskforce to investigate the issue of representation of institutions in ENA, governance and interests of Aggregators.

Aggregators Working Group with a mission and work program can then be created according to the outcome of the preparatory taskforce. A memorandum of understanding (MoU) can be signed to have the recognition with which the aggregators can go to respective governments to request funding. An MoU isn't binding but represents a level of approval. To date there hasn't been a mechanism in place to give a better picture of aggregators differences, to bring the aggregator forum into ENA so to be recommended to Foundation Board.

The aggregators have diverging interests. A working group is less powerful than a forum and doesn't solve the problem. Perhaps an aggregators taskforce can be extended aiming towards the role of the aggregators in the light of the upcoming aggregators landscape, all three domain, thematic and national aggregators in one taskforce which goes beyond DSI, with a joint strategy. It is an important issue but a working group is not the right channel or the best way to raise the issue and get a decision. ENA deals with policy level issues not operational. Another way to do this is to go to the Foundation Board asking them to listen to aggregators and their technical grievances. After the proposition has been properly tabled and considered, there is an official channel to present it to the Governing Board.

➔ Action 9: SB/JM - To submit a formal proposal on Aggregators Working Group for the Council to decide online.

UZ on libraries and EuropeanaTech

Libraries have representation in the MC and they are very well represented in the Foundation Board, they too have diverging interests (national, local, public, private), and they have a strong impact on Europeana through hosting. The goal of the proposed permanent library working group would be to gradually expand ENA as a platform for professional interest groups, to address any library related activity/issue in Europeana and to facilitate a continued dialogue. Some ideas for the working group are borrowed from other networks' terms of reference and adjusted to the needs of a library taskforce which form a draft ENA Libraries Working Group Terms of Reference. Most of the work is done virtually so it doesn't require big financing. The current AGM, elections, etc. Working Groups could be renamed as Committees and include MC members only. The library working group could become a permanent entity chaired by one of the MC members and open to every ENA member to join. It was also proposed to formally move Europeana Tech to ENA as a working group.

There are concerns over bringing in another layer of complexity, and that as one of the effects of creating such groups the Network would split. Is difference between the individuals and institutions really relevant? The value of the Network is in the sense of community and that it's informal and people can share.

➔ Action 10: UZ - To submit a formal working group proposal for decision by the Council online.

MdN on benchmarking
[Report on benchmarking](#)
MdN's Presentation

As partner in DSI and with some money from the project, [DEN](#) [Foundation](#) conducted a comparative analysis of cultural content available on the net to benchmark Europeana. It s a first step and together we think how to carry on. There are 14 elements as characteristics of cultural content service per core value to compare. The methodology is explained in the appendix. The survey was the starting point and the conclusions showed that on mutuality Europeana ranks high, on reliability Europeana is in a low position due to its incomplete metadata but the data creation processes place Europeana as average. On usability Europeana ranks high on scope of collections and services while it's average to low on access. As a whole, Europeana has been successful in being exclusive but data quality and access need to improve. The way forward: 1) assess and improve benchmarking methodology, 2) analyse and learn from other cultural information services, 3) repeat the benchmarking with data from 2016, 4) discuss how it relates and can be useful to the formal evaluation. To do these, MdN suggests to set up a taskforce or a working group.

> ➔ FD, LC, OS, SB and MW are keen on joining the Benchmarking Taskforce.
> ➔ Action 11: MdN - To formally submit a 6-month taskforce proposal for the Council to decide upon. MC will reflect on its future going forward.

Taskforces get money from the Association, working groups don't. There are exceptions depending on whether the working groups existed previously.

VIII. [Thematic Collections CEF Call](#)

The 2016 CEF Telecom Call - Europeana with an indicative €2 million of funding available for proposals in this area will be closed mid Dec. Europeana Foundation is interested, with two joint proposals: a proposal on rise of literacy in Europe - manuscript to mass media with text as leading theme (library material) covering manuscripts, books and newspapers. The second proposal focuses on migration in the arts and sciences with emphasis on AV and aiming to get in more AV material.

IX. <u>Voting/elections update</u>

[Update on General Assembly meeting](#) (scroll to the end of the document)
[Members Council elections](#)
RK's Presentation

48 candidates came forward for 2016 MC elections, among whom 28 male and 20 female, for

28 seats. Elections period starts with RC's launch during the morning session of 8th Nov. at the AGM and ends at 23h59 CET on 14 Nov. A public announcement of the results will take place on 21 Nov. The new MC officially start their term on 1 Jan 2017.

The call for MB candidates will be issued on 1 Dec. with a deadline of 15 Dec. The MB elections take place between 10 and 17 Jan 2017 and the results will be announced on 20 Jan.

In this round of voting, the Councillors have three votes and they are asked to vote for approval of: 1) Minutes of the 2015 meeting of the General Assembly; 2) Amended Association statutes; 3) Financial report 2015; 4) Provisional Budget 2017 5) Association's Annual Report 2015-2016; 6) Association's Activity Plan 2017. There is a slight difference in terms of approval of various items *i.e.* some need a simple majority, others not. During the General Assembly meeting, the participants will be asked to vote with a show of hand on the same items which will be complemented by the electronic voting.

There might occur a situation where there are equal votes, in which case those with a tie vote will go to a second round of elections.

Wrap-up and end of meeting

At 18h00, the meeting ended. MK thanked the Councillors for a great constructive meeting and UZ for fantastically hosting the meeting. There is a lot to learn in the lessons-learnt session, in particular to create more opportunities for direct input from the Councillors from their community into the MC and vice versa. He invited the Councillors to be more proactive in building the agenda for MC meetings. Two working groups and one taskforce proposals will come to the table.

End