Europeana Foundation Governing Board Meeting

23 November 2017
16h30 – 18h00 CET
Teleconference

Precis of Public Minutes of 28 September 2017 Meeting
Action proposed: These minutes were approved by Chair for public dissemination.

Attendees:
(PK) Paul Keller, Kennisland, The Netherlands - Chaired the meeting
(EN) Elisabeth Niggemann, National Library of Germany, Germany
(UZ) Uldis Zarins, National Library of Latvia, Latvia
(JLR) Joke van der Leeuw-Roord, EUROCLIO, The Netherlands
(MS) Merete Sanderhoff, SMK, Denmark
(AM) Agnès Magnien, Institut national de l'audiovisuel, France
(MK) Max Kaiser, Austrian National Library (ONB), Austria
(BD) Brid Dooley, FIAT-IFTA, Ireland
(JO) Johan Oomen, Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision, The Netherlands
(MR) Mirjam Raabis, Ministry of Culture of Estonia, (sitting) Estonian Presidency
(AB) Axenia Boneva, Ministry of Culture of Bulgaria, (succeeding) Bulgarian Presidency
(LA) Lora Aroyo, VU University, Bulgaria
(KH) Karin van Honacker, EURBICA, Belgium
(MP) Martijn Pronk, Van Gogh Museum, The Netherlands
(SA) Susana Alegre, Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport of Spain, Spain - on behalf of Conca Vilarino

Observers:
(EK) Elsbeth Kwant, Koninklijke Bibliotheek (KB), The Netherlands

Apologies with comments, approvals and votes before the meeting:
(LH) Lorna Hughes, University of Glasgow, UK
(EF) Etienne Ferrito, National Archives of Malta, Maltese Presidency
(JF) Jeannette Frey, Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche (LIBER), Switzerland
(MHS) Monika Hagedorn-Saupe, International Council of Museums Europe, Germany

Apologies:
(JM) Jan Muller, International Federation of Television Archives (IFTA), The Netherlands

Europeana Office:
(JC) Jill Cousins
(HV) Harry Verwayen

Co-financed by the European Union
Connecting Europe Facility

(AV) Albert Verhaar
(SA) Shadi Ardalan

NB: Some discussions are omitted from this version as they are deemed confidential to the Governing Board at this point in time. The public meeting papers and documents referred to in these minutes can be seen at the bottom of this page on Europeana Pro.

PK opened the meeting as chair, followed by a tour de table. The meeting was quorate with fifteen Board members present and four apologies, who provided some comments, approvals and votes prior to the meeting. The Board adopted the agenda and welcomed Elsbeth Kwant, Strategic Advisor - Koninklijke Bibliotheek as observer. PK chaired the meeting in absence of JM and Vice Chair MHS. He will decide on these minutes and the action on its precis.

Decision 1: The Board formally appointed Elisabeth Niggemann - Director General of Deutsche Nationalbibliothek as a Board member taking the seat of expert and as Chair of Europeana Foundation, replacing Jan Muller, from 28 September 2017. The Board also appointed Brid Dooley, Head of RTÉ Archives and President of FIAT/IFTA replacing Jan Muller as representative of content holder associations for two years from 28 September 2017. Similarly Axenia Boneva, State Expert at the Directorate International and Regional Activities of Bulgarian Ministry of Culture was formally appointed as representative of Member States under the Bulgarian Presidency until 30 December 2018.

Minutes, Decisions & Actions of 6 April 2017 Meeting

MS said her comment related to non-curated automatic thematic collections should be placed at the end of the first paragraph under section VII. All decisions have been implemented and all actions are completed. DSI-2 financial reports are under construction and will be shared with the Board when final. The public precis of last meeting minutes was approved by then Chair JM and published on Pro on 14 September.

Decision 2: The Board approved the minutes, actions & decisions and public precis of minutes of 15 June 2017 meeting.

Governance

Decision 3: The proposition in paper 2 was generally well received in its scope by the Board. 1) The terms Europeana operator / Europeana service have to be defined and differentiated. 2) A stronger justification has to be included why the chair of committee should be neutral / independent. 3) MS are also likely to wish to resist the EC having full control over the new committee. 4) The independent and central role of ENA has to be well defined and safeguarded in any scenario. 5) There is an agreed need to have influential individuals in the composition of the committee. 6) it is very important to have the EC onside. The revised proposition based on the above will be taken back to the Commission with the intent to get the two positions closer. The Taskforce will continue its work to incorporate the points from this meeting. The discussion on strategy will take place in the next phase of negotiation with the EC.

Action 1: The procurement governance taskforce composed of PK, MHS, MP, UZ, JLR and JC were reinstated to finalise the Governing Board's proposition based on the Board's discussions / decisions, and serve as a sounding board for Europeana Foundation in negotiation with the Commission.

Aspiration & Approach

One of the main reasons to update the vision and mission of Europeana was to clarify the role of EF and ENA. It has already proven beneficial. The proposal to make editorial changes to the approach of Europeana Network Association was refused because it slightly changed the sense and also because of the effort put by the MC in formulating and approving it as final approach of the Network Association. It would have been demotivating if the approved version was modified. The use of "*we lead change*" in the third paragraph of the internal version of Europeana Foundation Governing Board and Staff approach had been debated. It replaced "*we catalyze change*". The " deciding on strategy" in the approaches may need to be changed based on the remit of the advisory committee under procurement. Instead of repeated use of approach and aspiration, we can say "we aspire to" and "how we approach".

Decision 4: The Board unanimously approved the Joint Aspiration and Europeana Foundation combined Governing Board & Staff Approach as detailed in Paper 4. These will be read in conjunction with the previously approved Europeana Network Association Approach. The Board also agreed on the next steps to have the Aspiration and the Europeana Foundation's Approach stipulated in the statutes of the Stichting replacing the old ones. Due to the timing and the cost involved, the change in statutes is deferred until the governance under procurement takes shape so all the necessary changes can be made in one attempt. The Management Board of the Network Association will bring the approved Joint Aspiration and ENA's Approach in front of the Annual General Assembly on 6 December 2017 together with other proposed changes for stipulation in the statutes of the Network Association.

Briefing Book against [Business Plan 2017](#)

- *Issue of hosting*

The German Permanent Representative Juliane Thümmel has enquired through the DCHE Expert Group about the state of play concerning the hosting problem. Having a European solution (IBM Germany and their Dutch partner SLTN) and the taken measures were shared with the Governing Board and were reiterated at the 11 May 2017 DCHE meeting (see the [minutes, page 11](#)). Dr. Sophie Engelhardt was also notified directly.

Action 2: JC to respond to Juliane Thümmel informing her of the state of play.

- *DSI-2*

The Chair thanked MP for chairing the DSI-2 steering Board. The DSI-2 review took place on 27 September.

- *DSI-3 and Procurement*

JC - An inception meeting was held on 26 September which constituted the first formal discussion between the procurement entity (European Commission) and the DSI-3 service provider (Europeana Foundation). Europeana is now under the DSI-3 closed contract procurement. The open procurement tender will be issued in November 2017. The Network Association is written in the procurement and is therefore part of the procurement.

The Board - enquired about alternative horizons to procurement. JC clarified funding mechanism options are thin: grant, procurement, ERIC and agency. There is still no appetite for the option of agency. There is an internal drive in the Commission to reduce the number of agencies. The option of ERIC requires us to become a research infrastructure. There is no reluctance in the Council Conclusions to investigate possible options for the next multi annual framework. The Board is therefore willing to investigate possibilities of other funding mechanisms looking at the next multiannual framework from 2021. The evaluation will also look at funding for Europeana. Some Board members believe the Board should be less defensive to safeguard the position of Europeana not waiting for solutions to be imposed.

Decision 5: The Board suggested and agreed to form a working group consisting of JLR, EN, AM and JC to look at how realistic it is to form a taskforce and explore what alternative funding mechanisms exist.

Decision 6: The Board agreed on the necessity to investigate how to protect Europeana against confidentiality and non-disclosure and asked Europeana Office to carry out an inward due diligence.

Decision 7: MK was appointed as chair of the DSI-3 Steering Board. The role comprises critiquing the progress reports and evaluating the risk assessment from the viewpoint of the Board as its steering structure, informing the Board of the progress / risks and making recommendations to help decide on responses to the review comments.

- *Generic Services 2018*

JC - The French representative on DCHE Expert Group, Marie-Veronique Leroi reaffirms the French satisfaction of the funding brought up to 75% but expresses concern over the fact that "*generic services / thematic collections, as conceived by the MS under the Council Conclusions, are perceived as a «burden to the core service funding». Thematic collections could be great opportunities for European cooperation and add value to specific themes, reducing the work which relies solely on the Europeana Foundation staff. It could also help support digitisation and best practices exchange.*" JC explained the issue is not that Generic services are a burden but that money has been taken from the core service platform to fund the Generic Services. While we back, and indeed pushed for, Generic Services for the reasons outlined by MVL, it should not be at the expense of the core service. This results in the situation that Europeana will not have enough resources to make the Generic Services interoperable and part of the overall service.

- *Support for Europeana in CEF*

JC - The CEF Telecom Committee has a scoping document which defines their plans for 2018. The briefing we wrote and asked the Board to send out to their CEF members results from our meeting with the French CEF Telecom member Jean-Jacques Leandri, the French representative to European committees (eIDAS, CEF TELECOM and ISA), e-

government Action Plan Steering Board, and former National Expert at the European Commission (DG Internal Market). AM and Marie-Veronique Leroi, the French representative on DCHE were present at the meeting. The Dutch CEF member may raise the concern at the CEF Telecom Committee meeting on 17 October[1] and we hope the French, German, Danish, Bulgarian, Spanish, Italian and Estonian CEF members would follow suit and support the reasoning. We also ask EN to help get support from Germany. The reduction of one million would put Europeana in a difficult situation. The running cost of EF including the Network's costs is about €5.5 mil per year. It could potentially lead to a reduction for instance, in the Network budget, currently at around half a million euros per annum. We are also being asked to expand our activities in Education extensively, which will not be possible with the reduction in budget. The increase of funds for Generic services is great but, it should not be to the detriment of funds for the core service. The danger is that we increase the uses and integration requirements on the core platform while reducing its capacity to meet those requirements. One of the intents of switching to procurement was to give 100% funding of the core platform.

The Board - MP, UZ and MS have contacted their CEF Telecom Committee members. The Danish CEF member will raise the concern if opportunity arises in the meeting. The Swedish CEF member will take our call for support into consideration. Members of the Board felt that the brief is too weak and does not reflect the gravity of the consequences. It should say that the budget cut is not only a loss to Europeana but in the end to the service and the users. This is not the first budget cut Europeana goes through. The budget shrinks slice by slice undermining Europeana's ability to deliver its vision and strategy. This has long term consequences for the entire Europeana ecosystem. €8 mil is the absolute minimum for a growing platform. The Brief should make reference to the mention in the Council Conclusions that Europeana should be supported roughly at current level. The reduction is not in line with the statement: "Europeana and Safer Internet, which are identified as well-established in the CEF Telecom Guidelines. Funding will ensure their continued operation in accordance with the Guidelines." Nor does it comply with the [Recital 9 in the CEF Telecom Guidelines (11 March 2014)](#) which reads: "*As well-established digital service infrastructure, Europeana and Safer Internet for Children should have priority for funding. In particular, the continuity in Union funding from other Union programmes to CEF should be ensured in the first years of the multiannual financial framework for the period 2014-2020 laid down in Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1311/2013 (3) in order to allow for uninterrupted and successful delivery of service at the same level as provided for under the current funding scheme. On 10 May 2016, the Council underlined the vital importance of ensuring the long-term viability of Europeana, including in terms of governance and funding.*" The time, energy and cost we spend to handle the consequences of the shrinking budget are efforts in vain. We should rather be looking at opportunities to create and build and have the liberty to work towards our core mission. The amount being cut is of little value in the big picture. We should show the direct effect of the cut if we can foresee the impact, for example the work on the search engine, any work on multilingualism or interoperability. Can we ask the EC to give some reasoning why they reduce the budget.

Action 3: JC to improve the text and tone of the briefing based on Board's comments making it sharper and stronger emphasising the consequences and losses that the effective reduction in budget would bring. JC to share the updated briefing with the Board

---

[1] The Spanish member of the Committee raised the issue.

so the rest of the Board members can contact their CEF colleagues with the improved argument.

- ***Evaluation of Europeana***

JC - The evaluation panel of experts are: Dieter Fellner, Laure Kaltenbach, Jarred McGinnis, Piotr Rypson, and Gianna Tsakou. The objective of the panel is defined in the evaluation roadmap. The panel convened in June in an initial meeting and would like to meet the management of Europeana in the second week of November. In line with the requirements and procedural steps of the Better Regulation Guidelines for evaluations, a public online consultation will soon be launched. Europeana and its stakeholders will be informed as soon as it is launched[2].

The Board - There is a lot of support for Europeana in the Council. A tepid evaluation outcome is not good for the image of Europeana. It's common in some countries to put a self evaluation document forth to show what is achieved. Representatives from the Board should attend the November meeting with the Panel together with Europeana management. It is important to ensure the panel also speaks with representatives of the Network Association. The question is whether they evaluate the way the idea of Europeana is executed or the idea of Europeana itself. It is also the evaluation of compliance with the guidelines. The scope is wide.

Decision 8: Representatives from the Governing Board and the Management Board of the Network Association should meet with the Evaluation panel in November. The chairs of EF and ENA to approach the panel to meet and discuss Europeana.

- ***Business Plan 2017 Progress and KPIs***

The Content Report; Web Traffic & Social Media Report; Status of KPIs

HV - To better understand why google doesn't index Europeana data, Europeana has done an experiment. Submitting only 10 million objects, with better quality metadata, 35% was indexed. Normally out of 53 million objects only 17% is indexed. The experiment suggests a relationship between metadata quality and the indexing. Europeana has done everything to comply with Google requirements. Google strategy is a black box. It was affirmed by Google that Europeana pages are not seen as unique. We should think of ways to make Europeana more of a hub so that Google recognises that Europeana isn't a content farm, but a legitimate aggregator. The state of play at the moment is to be less dependent on google for traffic, we have found the solution in increasing our presence on social media. We extract it from DBpedia and replicate it in Europeana. It solidifies our relationship with wikipedia. Traffic and the indexing issue will be on the agenda at the next Board meeting on 23 November.

The Board - The relation between data quality and traffic also comes out in the impact study. The more you give, the more you get. In line with Europeana's role, together with other institutions such as Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek and Gallica, we should join the

---

[2] The Governing Board and Europeana Network Association have been informed and invited to participate in the survey. The consultation, available in all EU languages, will run between 17 October 2017 – 14 January 2018 and is open to all organisations and members of the public with a personal or professional interest in digital cultural heritage, or in Europeana in particular.

forces to ask google what would work, and run a shared research project to surface the widely felt issue with Google indexing. The solution might be in the data having an anchor text rather than only a link. Europeana should check Google's Knowledge Graph aggregate and find how high Europeana is. It's also useful to see how much of the schema annotation works. German Perm Rep, Juliane Thümmel suggests Europeana should put the numbers into perspective. The numbers regarding Europeana's reach sound convincing but they don't show where Europeana stands compared to other institutions.

Action 4: LA to visit Europeana, meet with the technical team, suggest experiments and together write a statement paper on the state of play and formulate a shared research project.

The Board - With [Europeana's Content Strategy](#) in place, maybe we can focus on how to upgrade the data quality in 2018 business plan. Is poor quality material better than no material? We should not however underestimate the impact of tier 0 on a poor user experience and the search engine rankings.

HV/JC - No KPI is set on the total number of objects. The Europeana search algorithm does now bring better quality material to the top. We look at data sets and with the provider, improve the quality. If we can't, we remove them. Based on the updated strategy we are going for quality. Our original scope was to make cultural heritage available and there was a place for lower quality data there. This is the legacy of how Europeana was set up and all the projects contributing to it. The notion of "poor quality is better than nothing" is true for users in research but depending on user requirements, the statement might not be valid for all types of users. We should also take into consideration the impact of bad user experience.

- ***Metis and Operation Direct***

JC - The presentation at 2016 AGM caught Europeana directors by surprise. We learned the lesson it's great to be open about what we are doing but not while still developing or conceiving as this leads to false expectations. The independent report underlined our growing conviction that the data we are dealing with is not simple and requires human interaction and interpretation to standardise it and get the 65,000 cultural heritage institutions across Europe fully interoperable. We are more and more convinced we need intermediaries. We decided to spend some of the DSI-2 money to evaluate the technologies and organisational remits of operation direct / metis; to have an outside expert eye and to make sure we are not making a wrong decision. This resulted in the report in Paper 5E Metis and Operation Direct. We will publish the report when we can say what we've done and what we are going to do. Europeana currently has a very good interim director but cannot afford to keep him. The full report is already shared with the DSI-2 reviewers, also among some of the evaluators, who were the reviewers for DSI-2. We will publish the full report with an appendix detailing the next steps.[3]

The Board - The report on Operation Direct is a self evaluation and a driver for development. The idea of Operation Direct was promising and this report is an excellent piece of communication about it. The report is positive for Europeana as it showcases the big ideas and underlines the transparency practiced at Europeana. Operation direct

---

[3] We have now shared the report with the Aggregators along with the actions that we have undertaken. It has also been shared with the EC and for DCHE.

shed light on existing problems and gave way to the opportunity to focus on other solutions and perhaps greater ideas. Any digital institution can relate to this. It is the core of Europeana so we should be open and transparent about it but we should also be tactical. Re the comments on EDM it is worth noting that DPLA and DDB went back to EDM while they rejected it in the first place. The DCHE is also very interested in the full report.

In reply to Dan Matei (Romanian representative on DCHE) who asked *what the arguments against Operation Direct are and how about the idea of online editing of Europeana metadata;* the idea of online editing will not be delivered until DSI-4. The aim is to give trusted aggregators direct access. Marie-Veronique Leroi (French representative on DCHE) asked about *the criteria used to analyse Metis and Operation Direct and the financial and human resources. She suggested that given the importance of the choice of one over the other, it is important to get this validated by AGM or DCHE.* The full report which will be published with precise next steps includes the criteria.

- *Copyright Reform*

PK - The Legal Affairs Committee is deliberating to find a common approach and a compromise proposal. There is a lot of openness for our proposal thanks to a strategy of reaching out to publishers and rights organisations to try to show that our proposal is not likely to cause harm. It is hard to make predictions but we feel the end result at the Parliament will be more accommodating of the concerns of the institutions. Institutions have been approached for consultation on copyright. There are two parallel time frames: the Parliament timeline is transparent and the voting is likely happening 20 November[4]. The Council's is not known. Overall, the most controversial subjects are press publishers and upload filtering.

Marie Veronique Leroi (French representative on DCHE) - *Although France fully supports Europeana as a major European and cultural project and innovative platform, it does not support Europeana's lobbying for copyright which goes against French national policies. This was said before in the occasion of previous Europeana Board meetings, but as it has not been recorded, the position of France is reiterated here again.*

- *Support of European Year of Cultural Heritage*

JC - Europeana is working with DG EAC who's running the European Year of Cultural Heritage and is on their stakeholders and national coordinators committees. DG EAC was approached by Google. The Google proposal consists of: a YouTube Video Campaign and an Online Collection/Exhibition on the GA&C platform. Both would be co-branded with the EYCH visual identity and DG EAC would be closely involved. The Online Collection/Exhibition would involve partnering European cultural institutions, young curators and young citizens to co-create online exhibits on the GA&C platform/app. This format will ensure that each exhibit is an expression of a dialog between generations, which fits very well with the EYCH's objectives. The themes of the online exhibits are yet to be chosen. This is where EC would see a role for Europeana. We are going to demand a stronger role for Europeana.

The Board - It looks like a really challenging task. Based on personal experience of some Board members, Europeana may end up doing everything and Google takes the glory. Board members' experiences of working with Google have not been very positive.

---

[4] This has now been delayed until late January 2018.

Decision 9: The Board agreed Europeana should demand a stronger role in its participation at the European Year of Cultural Heritage.

VI. Any Other Business

- The Board found the new meeting briefing book format helpful and engaging.
- Next meeting is a teleconference call on 23 November 2017.
- SA will start exploring possible meeting dates for 2018. [5]

End of meeting.

Circulation:
Europeana Foundation Governing Board Members & Observers

Classification:
Public

---

[5] 5 March – all-day physical meeting (10 am to 5 pm) – Frankfurt ; 11 April – teleconference meeting 16h30 to 18h00 ; 19 June – teleconference meeting 16h30 to 18h00 ; 21 September – all-day physical meeting (10 am to 5 pm) – The Hague/Amsterdam ; 20 November – teleconference meeting 16h30 to 18h00