

MB Meeting 8 January 2020, 14:30 - 15:30 CET
<https://app.gotomeeting.com/home.html>

MINUTES

Attendees Marco de Niet (MdN, Chair), Georgia Angelaki (GA), Sara Di Giorgio (SdG), Fred Truyen (FT), Erwin Verbruggen (EV), Albert Verhaar (AV), Zuzana Malicherova (ZM)

Apologies 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 2019-62: MB - to approve the final recommendations of the 3D TF online once the final report is submitted.**
- **Action 2019-63: ZM/MdN - to make changes to the TF review form based on input from the Board.**
- **Action 2019-64: MdN - to communicate the decision on change of their titles to the community managers at the common meeting in February.**

1. Review of minutes and pending actions from MB meeting 11 December 2019

The Board reviewed the currently pending actions. All the remaining ones are ongoing, the rest is completed. The meeting minutes of 11 December 2019 were approved.

2. MC webinar in March

- *Final agreement on date (18/25 March) - remains to be agreed via a Doodle poll).*
- *Initial agenda planning and focus of the meeting*

The following points were suggested for the agenda of the meeting:

- Communities work plans progress - the draft plans submitted by the SGs should be distributed to the MC for review at least 2 weeks before the webinar. At the webinar, the Councillors can give additional comments preferably in written form. Every Councillor should review at least one community work plan. Each SG can have a short presentation of their plan. The SGs are also free to consult the MC anytime until the webinar.
 - Results of the 3D TF and Research TF (if finalized)
- Follow up to session on digital transformation - the new Strategy will be published before 2 March and the next DCHE meeting will take place around mid March. The document + outcomes of the meeting will be shared with the MC as soon as possible prior to the

webinar. The session can be framed around asking for ideas on how the CHIs and Europeana can translate the Strategy and DCHE recommendations into practice and sharing of best practices. The Board can reflect on findings of the Lisbon meeting and then pick the most relevant parts of the Strategy and prepare specific questions for the Councillors to answer in advance in Mentimeter or in a separate document.

- Update from the EF by AV/HV
- ENA Impact Assessment - EF staff is preparing a survey to measure the satisfaction of the ENA members and the impact that the ENA can have on the digital transformation of the CHIs. The first draft will be shared online with the Board and the MC in February and sent out in March. Depending on the timing, the results of the survey could be communicated to the Councillors during the webinar.
- Preliminary recommendations of the EF Governance WG - if ready by mid March.
- Preparations for the physical meeting of the MC before the summer.

3. Communities

- 3D TF review process, including discussion on template for reporting

The review of the 3D TF was ongoing, KF received feedback from the three evaluators between 19 december and 9 January and was in the process of revising the final report.

→ **Action 2019-62:** MB - to approve the final recommendations of the 3D TF online once the final report is submitted.

Based on experience with the 3D TF review, the Board discussed whether the TF review form should contain an evaluation of content and quality of outcomes in detail. The present members agreed that the MC review should not be based on expertise but instead on assessment of usefulness of the TF results for the ENA at large, and whether they fit the community goals. This means that the form should be shortened and composed of a few (three) more open and broader questions. The questions on content/quality ones should be removed. In one of the questions we could ask for recommendations on how the TF results could be effectively distributed and applied by the EF and elsewhere. The questions should not be too precise in order to avoid putting pressure on evaluators - those with expertise can give a more technical feedback, others don't have to. It might also be better for the evaluators to ask questions instead of making comments and conclusions on parts of the report.

→ **Action 2019-63:** ZM/MdN - to make changes to the TF review form based on input from the Board.

- *Community work plans update (postponed for February)*
- *Pending issues/input for the MdN's meeting with community managers about the MB Recommendations (February)*

The present members agreed that community managers should facilitate community activities and provide practical support and advice, but running the community is a shared responsibility of the SG. It is up to the MB and MC to make decisions on actual rules and terms of reference. Instead of having long term discussions on rules, it is important for the SGs to focus on developing work plans. The Board doesn't aim to make the rules too formal as long as the formal roles and expectations are clear enough.

The Board took a decision to change the title of the 'community managers' to 'community coordinators' in order to bring more balance into sharing responsibilities with the community chairs and the rest of the SGs.

→ **Action 2019-64:** MdN - to communicate the decision on change of their titles to the community managers.

4. Recurrent agenda items

- Budget update

FT asked AV and HV for the transfer of the 2019 leftover budget to the 2020 budget and the request was approved.

5. AOB

- Reporting back on the progress of the Foundation Governance WG

GA gave an update on the work of the EF Governance WG. So far, the WG has met twice with an aim to propose a new governance structure for the EF. The following items have been discussed:

- EF should retain a certain level of independence from the Europeana initiative, but it should also remain inclusive, in order to present itself as the best qualified operator.
- Changes discussed with regards to the overall governance of Europeana and in particular to the EF Governing Board: the size and composition of the EF GB is being discussed including, the number of ENA MB representatives, the participation of the founding members, the participation of the MS, of like-minded institutions like the OpenKnowledge foundation and of invited experts. In this view, if the size of the EF GB may "explode", there will be a smaller executive board that will meet more regularly and will be composed of high profile higher management executives and the rest may form a larger advisory board.
- The EAF is going to discuss with the ENA and the EF options to advance its governance structure, how to have more visibility in the overall Europeana governance and how to align its activities with those of ENA and the communities.
- In case a person is a member of both the EAF and ENA MB, they may participate in the EF GB only with one role.