Europeana Network Association Management Board

18 March 2020, 14:00 -17:00 CET
GoToMeeting

MINUTES

Attendees Marco de Niet (MdN, Chair), Georgia Angelaki (GA), Fred Truyen (FT), Stephan Bartholmei (SB), Sara Di Giorgio (SdG), Erwin Verbruggen (EV), Marco Rendina (MR), Harry Verwayen (HV), Zuzana Malicherova (ZM), Henning Scholz (HS), Nicholas Jarrett (NJ), Julia Fallon (JF), Gina van der Linden (GvdL)

Actions

➔ **Action 2020 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 2020-8: HV/MdN/MR - to discuss the role and competencies of the EAF and ENA representative on the new EF Supervisory Board.**
➔ **Action 2020-9: MR/ZM/HS/JF - to share the Trainings TF proposal with the EF team, and the ENA Communicators community and discuss together how to proceed with it.**
➔ **Action 2020-10: ZM/HS/AV/HV - to clarify the EAF mandate and budget use for the EAF task forces.**
➔ **Action 2020-11: HV/MR - to discuss the advocacy task force and strategy for aggregators in 2020/beyond.**
➔ **Action 2020-12: MdN - to discuss with HV and AV how the work of the community managers for the EF aligns with their work for the ENA.**
➔ **Action 2020-13: ZM - Ask chairs and managers to consider highlighting their roles in work plans and divide and assign specific planned activity among SG members.**
➔ **Action 2020-14: MdN/GA/SB/ZM - to look at all the remaining community issues in the feedback document and discuss how to proceed with each point.**
➔ **Action 2020-15: MdN/JF - to look for possibilities to fit the Digital Transformation TF proposal into a wider collaborative effort across the Europeana ecosystem.**
➔ **Action 2020-16: FT - to prepare a budget overview per community for the forthcoming MC meeting.**
➔ **Action 2020-17: MB - each Board member to pick one of the seven proposed roles and send an email to MdN and ZM on what responsibility each would take on.**

[**Slidedeck**](Slidedeck)

1. EF Governance restructuring

● _Europeana Initiative update, consequences of Covid-19 pandemic on ENA & community work_

HV started the meeting by informing the Board that Julia Fallon has become the new manager of the EF's Community & Partner engagement team; and Douglas McCarthy is the new manager of the Collections Engagement team.

HV then updated the Board on the steps taken by the EF since special safety measures have been in place to tackle the spread of Covid-19. The EF has established a team that coordinates messages to staff while evaluating the situation and navigating the communications (blogs, newsletters, messages to stakeholders reflecting a common strategic positioning of the organisation). All the travels were suspended until (at least) the end of April; Europeana Presidency meeting in Zagreb in April was cancelled, the Aggregators Forum meeting in May will take place online. The EF might need to re-think the organisation of the meetings, workshops and even the Europeana 2020 conference into an online format. The office has been gathering relevant input and more details would be shared in the coming weeks.

HV emphasized that in the current situation the Europeana community - meaning ENA, aggregators and the Foundation - should join efforts and strengthen its leadership role in bringing the sector together online. Therefore in the coming weeks, the communications efforts should incorporate the view of Europeana as a joint initiative.

- *Europeana Initiative governance restructuring*

The EF Governance WG has proposed a new governance setup for the EF. The new setup proposes to have three governing bodies: *Director(s), Supervisory Board, Advisory Board.* The Supervisory Board would be a small group (7 persons) that would play a supervisory, advisory and an employer role for the EF directors. One seat on this Board is reserved for an ENA Board member (anyone), and one seat is reserved for the EAF representative. The EF Governing Board will set up criteria, which can determine who will be the representative of the MB based on profile requirements (financial expertise etc). The appointment process should be concluded by September.

→ **Action 2020-8: HV/MdN/MR - to discuss the role and competencies of the EAF and ENA representative on the new EF Supervisory Board.**

2. ENA and EAF: alignment and closer collaboration

- *Regular meetings and information exchange, task forces and working groups*

It was the first time that the Board had a combined meeting with the Steering group of the Aggregator Forum (EAF) and - HV on behalf of the EF - in an effort to achieve a better alignment and collaboration between them.

In january 2020, HV, AV, the EAF Steering Group (SdG, MR, HS) and ZM agreed on formalizing the EAF governance model using ENA's format. To that end, ZM joined HS in running the EAF secretariat in order to facilitate closer collaboration, meetings organisation and information exchange between the two. Originally, the EAF wished to have a relatively informal structure with the least amount of regulations and formal procedures possible, but over time the need for additional governance initiatives and activities arose.

The TF, WG and project related efforts should be aligned across Europeana initiative instead of adding more layers to the governance, which could be confusing for partners and users. The EAF governance aims to extend the ENA framework, as it needs to have its own voice in setting up initiatives that target the needs of aggregators. The EAF needs to be informed about relevant

activities planned within ENA communities, especially Copyright, Impact, and Education for CHI's that the aggregators could be involved in and collaborate. Some ENA TF proposals are highly relevant but go beyond the remit of ENA, and instead could be useful for the EAF and EF .

Both the ENA and EAF are going to be formally represented in EF governance in the Supervisory Board and will therefore meet five times a year. In addition, there can be a few operational meetings, like this one. Beside that, there should be regular EAF updates at MC meetings, and ENA updates at EAF meetings. Finally, a closer collaboration between the EAF and ENA is foreseen in Pro blogs and the ENA newsletter.

MR outlined that in 2020, the EAF aims to focus on:
- Formalizing and aligning procedures for workshops and training across Europeana initiative, and updating the EAF governance model:
  - Electing a third aggregator representative to the EAF Steering Group
  - Aligning electoral terms of the EAF SG members with those of the ENA, i.e. having elections every 3 instead of 2 years
  - Creating annual activity plan
- Knowledge sharing and outreach in the form of national workshops and training on data quality, EDM, IIIF, copyright etc.
- EAF meetings in spring (May, Netherlands) and autumn
- Running own TFs and WGs using format established by the ENA, open to collaboration with the ENA and EF:
  - WG on IIIF adoption, training, and translation of resources
  - Reviving the former ENA Library WG in the EAF format for library aggregators, which is better positioned to bring together 5-7 aggregators representing libraries that can replace the role of TEL
  - Advocacy TF (to be specified)
  - TF on training and knowledge sharing ('train the trainer" concept): aims to develop an effective structure to run training and workshops and effectively disseminate the knowledge. This TF can and should run under the EAF, but as a highly collaborative and coordinated effort shared by the EAF, ENA and EF. On the EF side, this TF proposal can inform the framework for 'capacity building' which the EF teams have started working on, and vice versa, the TF should consult and utilize this EF framework. On the ENA side, the Communicators community as well as other communities should play an active role in promotion and implementation of the task force results.

→ Action 2020-9: MR/ZM/HS/JF - to share the Trainings TF proposal with the EF team, and the ENA Communicators community and discuss together how to proceed with it.
→ Action 2020-10: ZM/HS/AV/HV - to clarify the EAF mandate and budget use for the EAF task forces.
→ Action 2020-11: HV/MR - to discuss the advocacy task force and strategy for aggregators in 2020/beyond.

3. Review of minutes and pending actions from MB meeting 5 February 2020

The Board approved minutes of the previous meeting. All the actions had been completed, only action 2020-2 was pending.

4. Communities

- *Feedback on principle discussions with community managers*

The Board members briefly reflected on the main takeaways of MdN's meeting with the community managers In early February 2020.
- It is unclear for managers how their work for the EF is aligned with their work for ENA. MdN and HV are going to discuss this.
- FT: Manager's role is incomparable with the one of the chairs and the rest of the SG members. Some managers work with people who are contractually involved with Europeana (in DSI), which makes them obliged to fulfill their expectations, but we cannot expect the level of involvement from Councillors and other volunteers.
- GA noticed that work plans written by managers employed by the EF are written from a different point of view compared to the Tech one, where the manager is not an internal employee. The EF managers' community work seems to be mixed with their DSI related responsibilities.
- SB suggested to adopt a minimal formal framework for community SGs. Membership rules could be formally aligned with the MC membership as described in the proposal on revocation.
- The managers also give the MB mixed signals, which creates contradictions (procedural freedom vs. many formal procedures in place), but SG relations also depend on personality traits and specific interpersonal relations. The Board agreed that basic rules should be in place but procedures to govern the SGs shouldn't go beyond necessary. The Governance WG can discuss this in more detail.

→ **Action 2020-12: MdN - to discuss with HV and AV how the work of the community managers for the EF aligns with their work for the ENA.**
→ **Action 2020-13: ZM - Ask chairs and managers to consider highlighting their roles in work plans and divide and assign specific planned activity among SG members.**
→ **Action 2020-14: MdN/GA/SB/ZM - to look at all the remaining community issues in the feedback document and discuss how to proceed with each point.**

- *Remaining issues: SG relations, Discussion of Membership rules*

The Board went through some of the remaining governance issues, primarily the community membership rules, which still haven't been completely specified and agreed upon. ZM and NJ put together a document based on talks with individual community managers on community benefits, channels and user journeys. In the attached document, they summarized the main findings, considerations and recommendations on the types of membership in order to help the Board make an informed decision on whether the community membership should be based on ENA membership or not. The team concluded that as long as the membership isn't clearly defined, it will keep causing logistical issues in recording and tracking of the actual community members.

The main recommendation is to make the formal community membership linked to the ENA membership, as there don't appear to be any significant barriers to becoming an ENA member. In that case, the main community communication channels such as mailing lists and newsletters would require for the community members to be ENA members. This decision will also have an

effect on 2020 ENA membership campaign: if the community membership is based on the ENA membership, the campaign will impact on the member count per community, and we should explicitly mention in the campaign messaging that by cancelling their ENA membership, people will no longer be formal community members.

Some problematic aspects were still remaining:
- So far, the Board has lacked a clear understanding of ENA vs community benefits.
- In general, the ENA and community membership should not be seperate, but some communities have historically had members (experts in given areas) that were not asked to join the ENA. Therefore, some managers are still in the situation when they wish to involve highly relevant community members but do not see the point of forcing them into ENA membership.
- SB and EV questioned the concept and benefits of having a community membership in place as such and suggested that the focus should be on activating and mobilizing the ENA members.
- ENA community membership could be inspired by IFLA, based on a model of multiple layers of membership depending on how active members decide to be. Another idea was to create a ENA members vs community associate model, where an interested party is not counted in and is only administered by a communications channel.
- There shouldn't be separate sign up forms as communities may come and go, and it would be confusing for the user.

The board asked the EF team to take the following steps and provide additional information before taking the final decision:

- ➔ In order to better understand the value of joining the ENA, define which benefits are exclusive to ENA membership (e.g. newsletter), and what is open to everyone
- ➔ Try to define status of most people involved in communities and ENA (report from Zoho and Mailchimp for each community)
- ➔ Ask community managers again if they would agree with community membership being linked to the ENA or not.

- *Submitted work plans and task forces*

The Board discussed all the submitted community work plans and task forces for 2020:
- Tech Work plan
- Education Work plan
- Impact Work plan, TF proposal on Impact Lite
- Copyright Work plan, TF proposal: How-to Guide for Labelling Cultural heritage
- Communicators Work plan
- Research Work plan

In various work plans it seems that the managers have included EF and project related activities in the community work plans, which is not a problem, but there might be different objectives and outcomes for the community vs the EF. Every community is entitled to an equal amount, but if some will end up spending less than others, the money can be re-distributed. TF proposals should be always formally submitted to the MB through the communities, following an assessment of the SGs. The TFs are primarily accountable to the communities, not the Board. Only in very rare occasions can a proposal get to the MB without direct involvement and

endorsement of a community. In these cases, if there is any budget left, the Board can consider approving additional proposals.

The Impact [TF proposal on Impact Lite](#), and the Copyright [TF proposal: How-to Guide for Labelling Cultural heritage](#) were approved. The remaining [TF proposal: Applying AR and multimedia](#) and [TF proposal: WallMuse](#) were not adopted by any of the communities. They were rejected due to procedural, budgetary, and strategic reasons, but they were given a chance to be reviewed again by the Copyright and Tech community.

[TF proposal: Digital Transformation, Literacy and Leadership](#): The Board reviewed this proposal and found it very interesting, as it touches upon one of the new strategic priorities of the Europeana Initiative. Digital Transformation will be a matter of the utmost importance for the sector in the coming years, involving all the main stakeholders. We need to discuss all the relevant aspects including governance, funding, capacity building, empowerment, leadership, infrastructures, technologies, etc. However, although the proposal touches upon a few specific topics in this wider spectrum, it still goes beyond the current format of an ENA community driven TF. The Board suggested that the EF 'takes over' this TF (financially) and helps coordinate and manage it so that it can be aligned with the EF capacity-building activities that are being developed. The EF team can look for a construct that involves ENA as well as EAF so that this initiative can run as a concerted effort.

→ Action 2020-15: MdN/JF - to look for possibilities to fit the Digital Transformation TF proposal into a wider collaborative effort across the Europeana ecosystem.

5. MC webinar 20 March 2020

- *Final agenda organisation*

The Board went through practical planning of specific agenda points. The main points on the agenda will be the introduction of the new Strategy (not ready at this moment), and community work plans review. The current versions of work plans were not finalized yet, therefore the chairs could reflect on comments they found interesting or those that need further discussion. None of the comments received so far were essentially too critical of the planned activities so there is no need to delay the approval of the plans. The review will be considered completed on Friday, and if anyone will have any remaining issues, they can always contact the SGs. The review objective is not to dive into details but instead to address feasibility of the outcomes and to make sure there are concrete results that the communities can work towards. Following the formal approval, the clean versions of the plans will be published.

6. ENA business

- *ENA and community budgets: update*

The 2019 budget was closed with around 11400 Euros underspent, which was used to fund two task forces approved in December 2019. The initial 2020 budget is the same as in 2019.

→ Action 2020-16: FT - to prepare a budget overview per community for the forthcoming MC meeting.

- *ENA impact assessment and satisfaction survey*

The preparations of the ENA impact assessment and satisfaction survey were initiated in autumn 2019 and the EF team planned to carry it out this month. MdN has been informed throughout the process. The results would be reported as part of the formal KPIs.

Half of the Board members found the questions generic, and possibly unclear, and questioned the survey objectives, the length of impact being measured, and questions that confuse ENA with the Europeana initiative. The other three members were supportive of sending the survey out with a few additional adjustments, and to make future improvements based on received feedback.

Finally, based on feedback received from both the Council and Board members, the EF team and the Board agreed that the survey should be further thought through and refined, and postponed for a while in light of the current crisis situation.

- *2020 Annual event update*

The foreseen dates for the annual event are 11-13 November 2020 in the Netherlands, but for the time being the plans are on hold and the format remains questionable. The office aims to keep the venue option but is also looking into the possibility of organising a virtual conference.

- *ENA on the new Pro; presenting ENA to the public*

The Board has seen a lot of improvement since the last testing sessions and compared to the previous version of Pro. The presentation of the ENA and community pages will be further discussed in the future.

- *Division of tasks among Board members*

As HV explained in the beginning of the meeting, the new governance setup has been proposed for the EF with three governing bodies. The Supervisory Board will play a supervisory, advisory and employer role to the Director. One of the seats will be reserved for the ENA and be filled by one of the Board members. This will lead to heavier workload for the ENA representative. MdN therefore proposed to distribute tasks within the MB more evenly as besides the formal roles of chair, vice-chair and treasurer, there have been no other formal divisions of tasks. If needed, the Board could consider adding an additional 7th member to help share the workload. The proposed division of tasks among Board members is based on 'key components' of ENA and its activities. Being the main contact person means being a proactive MB member on the specific topic and being the first sparring partner for the ENA secretariat. These proposed roles can be further specified or possibly combined.

→ Action 2020-17: MB - each Board member to pick one of the seven proposed roles and send an email to MdN and ZM on what responsibility each would take on.