Europeana Network Association Management Board

MB Meeting 20 February 2019, 10:00 -17:00 CET
Physical meeting: Leiden University Library
Heinsius room

Minutes

Attendees Merete Sanderhoff, Max Kaiser (MK), Paul Keller (PK), Johan Oomen (JO), Uldis Zarins (UZ), Marco de Niet (MdN), Stephan Bartholmei (SB), Georgia Angelaki (GA), Fred Truyen (FT), Sara Di Giorgio (SdG), Harry Verwayen (HV), Zuzana Malicherova (ZM), Victor-Jan Vos (VJV), Gina van der Linden (GvdL)

Apologies Erwin Verbruggen (EV), Joke van der Leeuw-Roord (JvdLR)

Actions

➔ **Action 1: ZM - to share the minutes of the previous and this MB meeting with the MC and on Pro.**
➔ **Action 2: MdN, MS & ZM - to agree on how to effectively schedule calls and report back on DCHE Sub-group meetings to the MB and MC.**
➔ **Action 3: MdN and MS - to have a call on 1 March with Marco Rendina on EC evaluation that needs to be addressed by the MB and MC.**
➔ **Action 4: MdN, GA and ZM - to have a call on 26/27 February to finalize the agenda.**

Meeting of the previous and new Management Board members (chaired by MS)

1. Handover of the previous Board

The previous Board members (MS, MK, PK, JO, UZ) started the handover session with providing useful advices and lessons learnt in terms of main responsibilities and tasks of the MB. They built their discussion around questions submitted by the new Board members (GA, MdN, SB, FT, SdG, EV) prior to this meeting:

Questions: direction of ENA in light of new Europeana Strategy formation, roadmap, branding, and related finances

In order to make it possible for the new Council to work better and take concrete steps in light of structural changes coming up (Strategy 2020-2025), the Board should use the current opportunity to start afresh and avoid lengthy discussions on past issues that have already been tackled by now.

The main challenge is to motivate the Councillors to work in between meetings and keep the meetings' momentum. The new Board was advised to clarify expectations of the MC and address

those Councillors that are inactive and do not participate in meetings and online discussions. Having a couple of regularly inactive Councillors makes the Council less functional.

The overall aim is to create a positive motion and make the MC and the ENA members feel that Europeana and ENA is influential in representing a growing community and a popular movement of thousands of people, which is also recognized and valued by the European Commission (EC).

HV and VJV clarified that Brexit is not going to anyhow affect the ENA. The Digital Europe programme mentions Europeana but does not guarantee anything. It is therefore important to support Europeana in lobbying with the European Parliament (EP) - including Councillors lobbying with MEPS in their countries - to get more by spring of 2020 when the new EC and EP are in place and settled. The EC recognizes ENA's relevance but it needs to see more tangible deliverables, especially regarding communities.

The Europeana initiative consists of 'trialogue' of the EF, ENA and Aggregator Forum (AF). Europeana overall has a factsheet for available for this purpose, and each of the three can have their own factsheet as well. They should follow a similar branding, e.g. the same logo but a different color.
The Board discussed the future possibility to have ENA activities supported financially from various sources (e.g. EU projects, membership fee) to help it be more active and influential in different fields. This is specifically the case for EuropeanaTech which is becoming a brand on its own and might need to facilitate more task forces than the current community budget allows.

The previous and the new Board members discussed what their motivation was to step forward for the MB, what their experience was and what they have valued most about it.

The previous Board members were motivated by their ability to shape the direction of the sector and have influence e.g. when dealing with the EC. They agreed that it was a valuable personal and learning experience for them, which also allowed them to strongly contribute to development and involvement of their own organisation. They have seen Europeana and ENA as a powerful vehicle to promote their values and beliefs in Europe, which is a privilege but also a responsibility that comes with a lot of work. It is about representing people and about who these people are. Being on the Board also gives opportunity for the members to understand the complexities of EU decision-making processes.

Engaging people has proven to work better within a community framework, which should be further developed. The leaving Board members advised the new ones to find ways to get most of every person's individual talents and expertise, and make it clear to the new MC that their role is very important and that being elected means representing 2300+ people, which is a big responsibility. It would be useful to have an open discussion on what the MB expects of the MC and vice-versa. Finally, the main task of the Board is to be enthusiastic and act as main ambassadors of Europeana.

HV and the rest of the attendees praised the previous Board for their biggest contributions: solving a lot of administrative issues, establishing six communities, being very active on the EF Gov. Board, and always acting as a unified team. It is important to engage with new potential ENA members and re-think the current membership rules.

2. Going through monthly re-current agenda items

- <u>ENA budget, ENA Communities, TFs and WGs , approval of new membership requests</u>

The previous Board members briefly explained the way they used to work during (teleconference) and in between (Basecamp and email) MB calls. An informal physical meeting the members had in February 2018 was very helpful in getting to know each other and finding a way to collaborate well.

During the meetings, the Board normally reviews re-current monthly agenda items, such as budget, ENA Communities, TFs and WGs , Approval of new membership requests.

- ENA budget - treasurer gives an update and informs the MB about any possible changes based on information provided by GvdL and Albert. Around three weeks before the MC meeting, treasurer checks with them if the information is accurate and up-to-date. In light of available budget, the MB assesses if there can be more than two MC meetings per year. If it comes to proposals to secure additional/more funding for the ENA, the treasurer and the rest of the Board should inform VJV.
- ENA Communities, TFs and WGs - ZM gives a brief overview of the latest developments and the Board discusses any outstanding issues.
- Approval of membership requests - done by a person responsible for governance issues and one more Board member based on review of the list sent monthly to them on Basecamp by TvH.

3. AOB

MS will take part in MB calls before the DCHE Sub-group meeting twice a year. She will also remain on the EF Gov. Board as an observer.

→ **Action 1:** ZM - to share the minutes of the previous and this MB meeting with the MC and on Pro.
→ **Action 2**: MdN, MS & ZM - to agree on how to effectively schedule calls and report back on DCHE Sub-group meetings to the MB and MC.
→ **Action 3**: MdN and MS - to have a call on 1 March with Marco Rendina on EC evaluation that needs to be addressed by the MB and MC.

Meeting of the new Management Board members (chaired by the new chair)

1. Appointment of the new [chair, vice-chair and treasurer](#)

The new Board appointed its members to their formal roles and elected MdN the new Chair, GA the new Vice-chair, and FT the new Treasurer of the Board and the ENA. SB agreed to take over governance-related issues.

2. Vision for ENA in the next 2 years

The new Board members went through a team exercise aiming to come up with a strategic direction, work plan, key topics and their milestones for ENA to be addressed and achieved by the end of 2020. The Board used a SWOT analysis to identify the following current strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for ENA:

Strengths:
- Number of members
- Crossdomain composition
- Rooted in European core values
- We have proven innovation in some areas (copyright, impact)
- Tech community as thought leaders
- Connection to other networks
- Democratic setup
- Core of dedicated people
- Relation with EF

Weaknesses:
- Engagement of the MC
- Benefits of membership unclear
- Not clear what ENA expects from its (new) members
- We overestimate our innovation in different areas
- Heterogeneous composition (too loosely connected)
- Lack of continuity (follow-up) on previous results
- Relationship with EF
- No clear branding

Opportunities:
- Other fora for networking are available
- New community setup
- Bring EU-level cross-domain curation into equation beside access
- Stronger connections with the EF and EC- strategies
- Innovative force of ENA (research, open science, education)
- More inclusiveness, capacity building and thought leadership
- Audience development approaches

Threats:
- Other communities/networks provide better/more information
- EC diverts attention to other areas/activities
- Lifecycle developments
- Identity politics
- Becoming too incrowdy
- Time constraints of members

Based on the above-mentioned strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, the Board members came up with a few combination/confrontation possibilities:

→ Relatively low-engagement of the MC in between meetings (W) can be improved with the new setup of **communities** (O).

→ Because there is no clear branding of ENA (W), it is not always clear what ENA expects from its members (W), and as their time is constrained (T), there is a danger of a lack of continuity and follow-up on previous results (W). We could address these issues applying **audience development approaches** (O), and by **getting inspired by other fora for networking** (O).

→ Unclear membership benefits (W) together with heterogeneous composition (W) and lifecycle developments (T) could be addressed by bringing **EU-level cross-domain curation** into equation as

a key value of the digital transformation of cultural heritage institutions.

→ **Stronger connections with the EF and EC/DCHE strategies** (O) can contribute to more focus, engagement, inclusiveness, capacity building (e.g. through trainings) and thought leadership (O) (although a close relationship with EF can be considered both a weakness and a strength)

→ The ENA has a core of dedicated people (S) but it can start to feel too 'incrowdy' for others (T), making it difficult for outsiders to get connected. Communities (O) need to find **a balance between exclusiveness, inclusiveness and becoming too heterogeneous**.

→ The ENA can improve its innovation capacity building by **reinforcing already existing thought leadership** in successful areas (Tech, copyright, impact) (S) and look for more opportunities in others (research, education) (O).

The Board agreed to pick five of these confrontations, present them to the MC and ask the Councillors to come up with concrete action plans and to set priorities and overall strategic direction for the ENA. The SWOT analysis can also be applied within each of the communities.

The overall aim is to have more members who become more actively engaged through communities and make ENA more known. The ENA should be an audience, a recipient, and a testbed for Europeana-related activities and projects. The lack of continuity is one of the main issues, and it might be caused mainly by the lack of time of members and lack of funding (lack of events and opportunities to meet up and collaborate).

3. Preparation of the MC meeting and outstanding issues

- *[MC meeting agenda](#)*

The Board discussed the draft agenda and updated it.

→ **Action 4**: MdN, GA and ZM - to have a call on 26/27 February to finalize the agenda.

- *[AGM/Europeana conference 2019](#)*

GvdL briefly presented the idea for a new format of the AGM to be combined with a large-scale conference on communities, following the example of EuropeanaTech. The Board felt positive about enriching the AGM with community-focused sessions, but asked for a balance between them, since Tech might have a much bigger focus than the other communities, and the original conference format for EuropeanaTech should not be completely abolished. The proposal is open to changes and suggestions for improvement and will be discussed again at the next MB meeting and upcoming MC meeting.

* The rest of the agenda items were postponed for the next Board meeting on 5 March 2019.