# Final Report: Network Participation Framework Task Force

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# 1. Task force participants

1. Marianna Anastasiou  (Music Library of Greece of the Friends of Music Society)
2. Stephan Bartholmei  (DDB German Digital Library)
3. Tamara Butigan (National Library of Serbia)
4. Valentine Charles (Europeana, Data R&D Coordinator)
5. Jill Cousins (Europeana, Executive Director)
6. Sergiu Gordea (AIT Austrian Institute of Technology)
7. Antoine Isaac (Europeana, R&D Manager)
8. Rolf Källman (Digisam, Sweden)
9. Zuzana Malicherova (Europeana, Europeana Network Association Coordinator)
10. Jef Malliet (Belgian Province of Limburg, Erfgoedplus.be) – chair
11. Gregory Markus (Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision)
12. Joke van der Leeuw-Roord  (Euroclio)
13. Gina van der Linden (Europeana, Network & Events Coordinator) – support
14. Hans van der Linden (Flemish Government. dept. of Culture, Youth and Media)
15. Wim van Dongen (National Archives, NLD)
16. Victor-Jan Vos (Europeana, Head of Programme & Policy )
17. Uldis Zarins (National Library of Latvia)

# 2. Introduction

One of the important tasks of the Members Council is to encourage Network Association Members to take part in the activities for maintaining and supporting the further development of Europeana. Association Members must feel involved.

The Europeana Network used to be an informal landscape of stakeholders, consortia, institutions or persons that participated in building, maintaining and developing Europeana. The Europeana Network Association was created in 2014 to organize this participation and to improve representation of all interested parties in the decision making process of Europeana Foundation.

Task Forces (mentioned in the Statutes and Bylaws) and Working Groups (in the Bylaws) are currently the instruments for such involvement. However, besides the Task Forces and Working Groups there are many other types of groups that have a history from before the Association was created. Many of them were initiated as project consortia around specific themes of communities with specific interests. Several still remain formally outside of the Association although many of their 'members' are also registered members of the Association. Two ways of contributing to the working of the Association have emerged during the first years of its existence that do not fit the current models of TFs or WGs:

- sub-groups of the Members Council (committees ?) that perform tasks on behalf of the Council itself, such as the Elections Committee or the AGM WG;
- sub-communities of the Network such as the Aggregator Forum, or the Libraries group that should be better integrated within the Association in order to properly participate in the new governance structure of Europeana, with the opportunity to represent the concerns of their own community;

The scope of this TF was to further streamline and consolidate the participation in Europeana activities by Association Members. The Network Participation Framework Task Force had the purpose to explore the situation and to find ways to better integrate all these groups in the activities and work of Europeana and to allow them to properly participate in the decision making processes.

We did this by investigating the experience to date and proposing elements for the 'Participation Framework', which can then be implemented by the Members Council as appropriate.

# 3. Activities of the Task Force

The TF Network Participation Framework has worked in Basecamp and held several meetings:

- 18 May 2017 (teleconference)
- 7 June 2017 (teleconference)
- 7-8 July 2017 (Copenhagen, annex to Council meeting)
- 18 August 2017 (The Hague)

Initially the goals of the TF were not firmly defined. The purpose was to collect ideas and suggestions for improvement of participation in the Network Association. Five areas were identified during the first meetings where improvements could benefit participation:

- Evaluation process of the Task Forces
- Categorization of Working Groups
- A concept of Communities within the Network Association
- The place of Aggregators in a possible Community structure
- Participation of the Member States and the place of MSEG-DCHE in the ENA

During the lifetime of the TF, several of the suggestions were further discussed and developed in broader environments:

- The Aggregators Forum meeting in Zagreb, 2-3 November 2017
- The ENA Members Council meeting in Milan, 5 December 2017.

# 4. Task Forces evaluation process

The terms of reference of task forces and working groups were developed and are maintained by the Europeana Office (Europeana Foundation). As task forces and working groups they are now tools of the Europeana Network Association, it would be advisable to transfer this responsibility to the Members Council on behalf of the Association, which is already in charge for their evaluation and approval.

Some issues have hindered the approval process for Task Force proposals by the Members Council in the past couple of years.

Fairness, Effectiveness, Efficiency principles should guide the approval process. The stakeholders proposing a task force deserve a fair and objective evaluation, and consequently it is expected that the best task forces get approved and funded.

However, the evaluation is always influenced by the level of knowledge possessed by evaluators on the task force topic. Therefore, subjectivity cannot be eliminated from the evaluation process, but the TF approval process should eliminate as much as possible subjective influences. The task force approval process can be considered effective when it manages to identify the task forces generating the higher impact with regard to the Europeana Business Plan and users' needs.

At the same time, the approval process must be time bound, the response must be delivered to the TF chair or contact person within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, the work associated to the evaluation and approval must be planned carefully and the individual tasks must be completed efficiently.

Issues discussed:

- Topics and expertise: Council Members do not feel familiar with the topic of the proposed TF

  The topics addressed by TF proposals are quite heterogeneous and specialized at the same time. Many MC Members are not experts in the work area of a specific TF. In this context, it is a challenge for MC Members to cast their vote, when aiming to take an informed decision.

- Workload: It takes some work / time to understand the proposal and formulate an opinion

  Even if the evaluation reports aim at summarizing the strengths and the weaknesses of the TF proposal, the MC Members still need to read the proposal and formulate their

own opinion before casting a vote. Approval of TF proposals is done by voting, and consequently this is also a time bound activity.

- <u>Communication</u>: It is not easy to find the voting form or the description of the proposal

  The deliberation over evaluation results (including analyzing their strengths and weaknesses) and the voting process require allocation of significant amounts of time during the MC Meetings. The alternative solution of using online voting offers the possibility to collect feedback from a larger number of Councilors. However, there we encountered issues to ensure the quorum for validating the online voting process.

  Approval by online voting allows more feedback from the Councillors. This process could be consolidated at a MC meeting, to get the last votes required or clarify the last doubts. This requires good planning of the process in conjunction with the calendar of MC meetings.

  At the moment it is not clear if the issue is related to the online communication mechanisms or if it is related to the difficulty to take a decision. Communication may be improved for a few aspects:
  - Some people seem to consider Basecamp messages as less important
  - The voting mechanism does not look like an official ballot

- <u>Officialization</u>: The request to vote comes from Europeana Office, it would be better from the Management Board

  There may be a need for a voting supervisor in the MB, who can officialize requests for voting.

- <u>TF composition</u>: The evaluation form doesn't include an evaluation of the proposed TF group composition (TF members)

  The current evaluation criteria are related to the alignment with the Europeana strategy, but there are currently no criteria defined to evaluate the quality of the TF participants. The quality of the TF group and of the proposal are orthogonal dimensions that should be taken in account in the evaluation process.

  Deliverable and timing should be clearly defined. It is hard to judge whether the chairs and participants can really commit to the work.

  Europeana Office liaison should be present in the proposal to be approved. Such liaison should be negotiated in advance.

- <u>Voting process</u>: The voting options are not very clear-cut: *Approve / Decline / Approve with adjustments*

We suggest to change the voting process by adding an *Abstain* option and decide by relative majority + quorum (instead of absolute majority).

It is not clear what 'approve with adjustments' means, and what should be done with the comments from the evaluating Council Members. As is often done for evaluation of journal papers a difference can be made between major or minor adjustments. 'Minor adjustments' then means acceptance, while 'major adjustments' means an invitation to re-submit (i.e. for a second round of evaluation and approval).

- Rejection: There are no clear criteria that would lead to rejection of TFs.

    What to do with refused TFs? The motivation of the rejection decision should include feedback and recommendations. Possible further action can be suggested, but each proposal must be considered on its own merits, case by case.

- Budget: It is not clear how the budget interferes with the approval process.

    Terms of reference indicate up to 10 Core Members of the TF. There should be place for invited experts in the TF who can participate in the work but cannot claim costs, and eventually cannot cast votes for decisions within the TF.

    Terms of reference indicate that 8 to 10 TF can be financed each year. We should ensure that the best ones are financed. A scoring system can be used for ranking TF proposals in an objective way. The funding of a second TF meeting can be made to depend on the submission/approval of the interim report.

    The Council does not appear to 'own' the budget for the Task Forces. It would be much clearer if there would be a certain yearly budget at the disposal of the Association for Task Forces and Working Groups.

    When reporting, the contribution of the TF/WG members themselves (mostly as time spent) is not considered. It would be good to include an estimation of the added value of the contributed efforts in order to better show the real cost and benefit in Europeana reports.

- Implementation of results: There is no official workflow for how to deal with results of the work from Task Forces. We need to identify what kind of products we can expect and how to go about appropriating them as 'official' Association documents. Then it can be decided how they will be promoted in the Association or with the target audiences.

    Implementation of the results can involve various levels:
    o Europeana Foundation
    o Europeana Network Association / Members Council

- o Data/content providers
- o Member States

Results can be of a wide variety of types:
- o Governance (e.g. guidelines for improving the strategy, mission, elections, etc.)
- o Dissemination (planning AGM, EuropeanaTech Conference, etc.)
- o Technical (including R&D, guidelines for improving Data Quality, new EDM Profiles, new research directions)
- o Policy making (e.g. Copyright, EC liaison, Member States liaison, etc)

Each TF itself should pay proper attention to the way in which their recommendations can or should be implemented or enforced, including an indication of feasibility. E.g. for a technical TF, participants might expect all the recommendations to be implemented by Europeana which won't always be the case. What the alternatives are to "implementation" is an open question to be answered by the TF itself.

We suggest that results should contain elements that allow evaluating the feasibility of the proposed conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation of the final reports should not so much focus on the content, but should rather look at whether there are sufficient elements to decide on the opportunity or necessity of implementing it.

Summary recommendations for the TF procedure:

- Process definition (move from one step to multistep + handover, terms of reference)
- Evaluation
  - update evaluation criteria:
    - (1) quality of the group (expertise, availability, especially the availability of the chairs). Chair and proposed members (e.g. minimum of 5 persons) should be able to effectively provide the proposed results, eventualy indicate invited experts
    - (2) quality of the proposal (clarity of writing, planning and deliverables). Extend the evaluation form to differentiate between strengths and weaknesses of the task force proposal. Also allow reviewers to make recommendation for additional aspects that should be addressed by the TF
    - (3) relation to existing/past Network activities (state of the art, context of the proposed activities) and current business plan must be expressed explicitly, including targeted community and expected impact
    - (4) appropriate liaison with the Europeana Office and the Council (no TF should be accepted with a blank there)
    - (5) communication channels: people should use Basecamp and commit to regular communication (calls) every X weeks. (Not just by ticking a box, but writing it down: the pain of the commitment must be visible)

- feedback from evaluators and MC Members and (when expertise of MC Members is not sufficient) external experts,
- Evaluation output (meta-evaluator, summary, recommendation - clear & formal communication)
- Voting process (abstain option + relative majority + quorum vs. absolute majority + voting obligation). Define the process to be followed in the case of approval with adjustments (second round of (online) voting or verification that all amendments were integrated in the TF description)
- Final decision (budgeting constraints, frequency, scoring)
- Some basic rules for assigning evaluators should be created. Conflicts of interest should be avoided. The nominated evaluators should have the possibility to decline appointment. A meta-evaluator should be appointed, he/she might be asked to present the results of the evaluation. The presentation of the evaluation results can be done in a standard format (e.g. prepare a Powerpoint template),
- TF proposals that are not approved can be encouraged to keep the initiative/community active, by suggesting to re-submit following specific recommendations, or by suggesting alternative actions.

The TF suggests to form a sub-committee of the MC/task force that would be responsible for managing the evaluation process of TF proposals and reports and oversee implementation of the TF Terms of Reference. It would be appointed and have its mandate renewed every year at the first MC meeting, such as e.g. Governance WG. It needs to be formalized and consist of e.g. 3-4 MC members, including one MB member. It would assess quality of the proposals as well as budget spending. The group can be responsible for appointing MC members for evaluation of proposals and timely delivery of the evaluation results. This would create a sense of responsibility and accountability within the MC.

> Spin-off
>
> The issue of improving the evaluation process and the working of Task Forces was on the agenda of the Members Council meeting of 5 December 2017 in Milan, as a breakout session. The discussion paper and results from the discussions are in **Appendix 1** at the end of this document.

# 5. Working Groups categorization

Until now, we have had the same name for all kinds of ENA groups. Those that function on a more permanent basis within the Members Council and perform tasks of the Council, get approved/renewed every year by the MC and can be called *Committees*, while more open topic-related ones such as Data Quality, involving also other ENA members, can be called *Working Groups*:

- Council *Committees* (WG within of the Council, doing Council Business), e.g. Governance, AGM
- Topic, theme development *Working Groups*, e.g. Data Quality, Copyright Policy
- *Communities* / Consortia / Interest groups, e.g. EuropeanaTech, Libraries

A distinction can also be made according to priorities and scope:
- Network Association TFs (e.g. our TF!)
- Network Association WGs (e.g. DQC)
- Other groups
    - Within the Network Association (kind of defined by the association: members of the groups are persons member of the association), e.g.
        - Network Association Communities (e.g. EuropeanaTech)
        - etc.
    - Outside the Network Association (if just because members are not individual persons, formally) , e.g.
        - Europeana Fashion Intl Association
        - Member States
        - etc.

# 6. Community structure

There is a consensus that besides TFs and WGs, there is need for a more representative form of participation, which we will provisionally call 'communities'. Some of such communities already exist, such as EuropeanaTech or the IPR community, others have a status of partnership in the DSI projects, such as CARARE or EuropeanaFashion, while still others are seeking their way of collaborating with Europeana, like in the Libraries WG or the Aggregators forum.

An interesting model can be ICOM, which besides its general membership of museums and museum personnel has set up interest groups and sub-community groups in the form of 'international committees', such as the CC (Conservation Committee), CIDOC (Documentation), ICTOP (Training of Personnel), CIMCIM (Musical Instruments), etc. These committees have their own governance and secretariat, they usually meet on occasion of the 3-yearly ICOM General Conference, and often also in between (e.g. CIDOC has annual meetings).

A similar way of working could be interesting for Europeana, with communities:
- Possible characteristics and working of ENA communities:
  - We don't need complex rules, but simple and flexible guidelines (e.g. minimum number of members, all committee members are ENA members)
  - Each community can organize/structure itself, but they are best approved/accredited as ENA community by the Council
  - Ideally each should be followed by a Europeana staff member, who acts as liaison
  - They can organize themselves to agree on candidate(s) for Council and get them elected, which is how they can participate in the governance of Europeana
  - They could set up a meeting of their members in conjunction with the ENA AGM (meeting spaces can be arranged e.g. a day before the AGM meeting
  - They can organize their own meetings and agenda, preferably focusing on their involvement with the ENA and EF
  - They can formulate proposals for TFs, WGs of interest to them
  - They can be the environments for negotiating about consortia for other European projects
  - A community will always consist of persons, but they (the community, or the institutions represented in the community) decide for themselves if the persons are 'official' representatives of institutions (for some communities this may be more relevant than for others)
- This structure can have many benefits:

- o Increased participation in the AGM: makes the AGM more attractive because the members can join side-meetings with particular points of interest
- o It can feed the ENA and Council with more concrete feedback from the distinct communities
- o It increases communication about Europeana
- o It helps to achieve better representation of domains/communities in the Council, and potentially in the governance of the Foundation

Suggestions for procedures and interaction with governance:

- The Governing Board can be advised by the ENA and experts/representatives of different communities before having a meeting and making decisions which concern these communities in particular.
- Communities can organize themselves, for example via a paper/call/action to have representatives in the Council.
- The communities would need to be approved by the MC, to acquire a more or less official status in the ENA.
- New members signing up for the ENA, can be asked to choose the community(ies) of main interest, they can then represent that community if they wish to be elected in the MC.
- ENA should avoid having too much of an institutional structure build-up, since the more structured the groups get, the more they will want to be equally represented in the governance of ENA (MC), which would endanger healthy flexibility. Some minimum common working rules are however desirable, even if it were only about naming representatives or governing body.
- Each community can choose a community leader and/or a community coordinator who liaises with the MC and MB. They should bring issues or important updates to the Europeana Foundation Governing board. This also works the other way around.
- It needs to be made clear what kind of support the communities can expect from the Europeana Foundation.
- They could get their own space on Europeana Pro to communicate with their members, though that the Office would be in charge of keeping a consistent tone of voice. They can set up their own mailing list or communication strategy
- As there could be a 'museums' community in the ENA, there could be similarly a Europeana international community in ICOM (museums and ICOM just being an example). Ways of interacting between these groups can be elaborated by themselves.
- We encourage the Library WG to experiment with the community concept and to work out their structure as ENA Community

- The aggregators forum could form another experimental ENA community, to verify in how far it is workable and can meet the expectations of the aggregators
- Other existing or new communities can be encouraged to set themselves up as ENA communities: e.g. current DSI partners, EuropeanaTech.

Test Cases: how do we proceed?

The communities model can be set up in a few cases to test the suggested ENA structure and rules and see how it can work.

- Libraries
  The new Library WG and community will be the first fresh case study where the proposed structure will be applied.

- Tech/Others
  How shall a community like EuropeanaTech approach MC elections and put forward candidates when they already have a core group of Foundation staff, ENA members and independent experts?

---

Spin-off

The issue of communities in the Europeana Network Association was on the agenda of the Members Council meeting of 5 December 2017 in Milan, as a breakout session. The discussion paper and results from the discussions are in **Appendix 2** at the end of this document.

---

# 7. Aggregators

Europeana was formed as a project out of The European Library. In the beginning there were no aggregators, the name applied to entities that collected data from several content providers, e.g. in other projects that provided data to Europeana. If we would go back in time and do it all over, probably the aggregators would now lead the process and they would certainly be represented in the Foundation's Governing Board today.

The AF (Aggregators Forum) has an ambiguous position: it does not belong now to ENA or EF as such. It has an intermediate position.

- Relevant persons and institutions (aggregators) need to be heard and need to have an official voice (institutional) - this could increase the value for Europeana.
- Ideally the AF should be in the position to give strong recommendations - if e.g. the Europeana office wants to invest in aggregation software, the AF should participate in that decision.
- This would mean that the AF should have its own structure and governance. This would mean they bypass the ENA.
- The Aggregators can be part of ENA for the sake of liaising and transparency.
- Aggregators - Institutions vs. persons
  Everyone agreed that we need to find a way to make aggregators represented as a group within ENA. At the moment, their group functions in a loose manner and they need clear provisions on who can register as an aggregator/data provider and how such members can be effectively represented in MC/MB/Foundation. A system of accreditation can help.

Concerns:

- Shall there be a community only for aggregators, or also for data partners (about 400 people)? It could be one big community for both, having a WG group representing both groups separately.
- ENA can bridge the relations between the Foundation and operators involved in Aggregator Forum. However, some aggregators don't seem to represent their institutions but rather their own opinions, there is a lack of regular communication among themselves, and members don't communicate information back to institutions in their countries.

- Officially it was agreed that only individuals can be members of ENA (this has been updated in Bylaws), although unofficially many represent interests of their communities /institutions.
- The aggregating institutions are all different so they cannot be commonly defined and can only be represented by individual members. However, it seems that aggregators are often not institutions anyway, but rather projects/initiatives of larger organizations.

---

Spin-off

An Aggregation TF set up by EF, with representatives of different types of aggregators are preparing a white paper on aggregation. This will provide elements for a better structured interaction between EF and the aggregators.

---

Spin-off

The issue of accreditation of aggregators as a more official group was on the agenda of the Aggregators Forum meeting of 2-3 November 2017 in Zagreb, in a breakout session. It will probably be taken up further in the next AF meeting.

# 8. MSEG-DCHE

In March 2017 the Expert Group on Digital Cultural Heritage and Europeana (DCHE) was created by the Commission to continue the work of the Member States Expert Group on Digitisation and Digital Preservation (MSEG). It '*will review and discuss policies for digital cultural heritage, notably by assisting the European Commission in monitoring progress and assessing the impact of the implementation of the EC Recommendation and related Council Conclusions.*'[1]

This means it has an advisory role about what Member States expect from Europeana. This advice is not addressed directly towards Europeana, but to the European Commission, the other side of the funding chain. In principle they are also stakeholders in the Europeana landscape, and indeed several delegates in the DCHE are also members of the ENA, as persons.
The DCHE as such can never be regarded as a 'community' of the ENA, as this could give rise to obvious conflicts of interest. However, a form of interaction (two-way) would be highly desirable.

This Participation Framework TF of the ENA had difficulty formulating suggestions regarding interaction with the DCHE, probably because the structure, role and working of the DCHE is not well known to most of the ENA members. But we would appreciate if the DCHE itself could reflect on the way they would like to interact with the Europeana stakeholders.

---

[1] https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/expert-group-digital-cultural-heritage-and-europeana-dche

# 9. Conclusions

There is no real conclusion to the work of this Task Force. Improving the working of the Europeana Network Association will always remain an ongoing task. Several areas for improvement have been identified:

- The Task Forces evaluation processes:
    - The approval of proposals
    - The evaluation of Task Force activity
    - The proper follow-up of Task Force results
- A better distinction of the various types of Working Groups
- A proper place for sub-communities in the Association
- Specific attention to the aggregators in relation to the Association and the Foundation
- The relation between the Member States (MSEG – DCHE) and the Association

Numerous suggestions were made on these issues, most of which are assembled in this report as a basis for further development and implementation. Some have already been taken up by the Europeana Foundation, the ENA Members Council and the Aggregators Forum, such as in the procedure for approval and evaluation of task forces, the structuring the ENA by communities and the accreditation of aggregators.

# Appendix 1

## Discussion Paper on Network Participation Framework: Task Forces
(Members Council meeting, Milan, 5 December 2017)

*This is a discussion paper prepared as a proposal document for MC meeting debate on ENA structure from 2018 onwards, based on findings and proposals of the Network Participation Framework Task Force*

The Network Participation Framework Task Force collected information and experience in several environments of ENA and Europeana Landscape where improvements can be made and would be beneficial to network participation. One of the proposals for action / final recommendations of this Task Force is to set up of a *committee within the MC* to manage the the TFs.

**Proposal on formation of MC sub-committee/WG on Task Forces**

The-committee of the MC would be responsible for managing the evaluation process of TF proposals and reports and overseeing implementation of the TF Terms of Reference. It would be appointed and have its mandate renewed every year at the first MC meeting, such as e.g. Governance WG. It formally consist of e.g. 3-4 MC members. It would assess quality of the proposals as well as budget spent. The group will be responsible for appointing MC members for evaluation of TF-proposals, and their midterm and final reports. This creates a sense of responsibility and accountability in the MC.

**Approval/rejection criteria for proposal, midterm and final report**

There are only a few guidelines for the evaluation process, and the evaluators review proposals briefly without having a lot of information at hand. We need criteria for approval or rejection that look at both positive and negative aspects.

The evaluation of TF proposals and recommendations requires assessment of both the MC to provide a strategy check, and technical experts (Foundation) to assess the applicability based on a clearly defined framework. The office should also take part in the evaluation process to assess how useful TF proposal is compared to past TF work or DSI projects funded by the Commission elsewhere.

So far it has been unclear what the follow-up to suggestions of the MC and end-result of the evaluation should be. There was a proposal for the MC to follow-up on the implementation of the final recommendations via the proposed sub-committee, which would assess feasibility of those final recommendations. The Foundation would assess the applicability of the recommendations in light of work done by the Foundation teams. The evaluation of the final

reports should not focus so much on the content, but should rather look at whether there are sufficient opportunities for practical implementation.

*Open discussion points for the MC breakout groups:*

→ Shall we have a MC sub-committee on Task Forces in place? If so, with what:
- tasks - managing the evaluation process of proposals and reports, oversee the implementation of Terms of Reference
- composition - 3-4 MC members + Office member
- criteria for approval/rejection

→ Deadline for submission of TF proposals: 2x a year, 1 month before every MC meeting (this is related to the current funding structure to ensure that the money is used. Reason for short deadlines is to fit in with the project funding).

## Summary of the discussions per group:

Group 1:

The group proposed 'Connecting to Open Infrastructures' as a new idea for a Task Force; and to have three types of Task Forces in place – two coming from ENA, one from the Europeana Office:
1. Addressing topics related to the current Business Plan (e.g. Impact and Migration Task Force)
2. Exploratory Task Forces for the next Business Plan
3. Ad-hoc Task Forces – engage in urgent matters, using the expertise of the Network (paid for outside of the ENA budget)

The Task Force evaluation process should be restructured so that there are 5 MC members in the Task Force Evaluation Committee, with no need to wait for approvals at the MC meetings.

Group 2:

The group agreed that the Task Force Terms of Reference should address the following issues:
- Describe the role of Task Forces towards fulfilling the Business Plan
- Automatically reject Task Force proposals that do not meet the criteria
- Implement consequences/fallback plan if a Task Force does not follow the ToR/does not meet deadlines
- Define and clarify criteria for implementation and evaluation of Task Forces, including their best practice examples.

Group 3:

The group agreed that the Evaluation Committee should be created in order to make the MC members more involved in the coordination of the Association activities and guarantee better results. The first task of such Committee should be to evaluate current Terms of Reference.

The group proposed the following Ideas to ensure the implementation of final recommendations:
- Promotional poster sessions at the AGM
- Use of channels like ENA newsletter and mailing lists
- The final recommendations themselves should include suggestions on how to maximize the chance for their implementation.

Group 4:

The group proposed a new Task Force idea: creating/evaluating a new framework/package for students/tourists to be able to create (semi-)automated exhibitions online that Europeana could use.

The group agreed that Task Forces:
- Should be related to the Business Plan, and address practical, often times technical matters such as  monitoring of progress of software and infrastructure development
- Be a strategy to involve ENA members in activities of Europeana
- Have an MC member appointed as a rapporteur who would be held accountable for results during meetings, or transfer of knowledge when needed.

The evaluation process needs to be re-thought, with the forms being more specific and adjusted for every proposal, making it more guiding and inclusive. The evaluation need more points and members should come from different background -  new Network members could be asked to fill in a more sophisticated form when registering, and specify their set of skills and interests.
Some Councillors agreed with the ideas of having an Evaluation Committee of 5 MC members, while others did not. The group suggested to give the MC some time to think about it and offer a concrete proposal of how such Committee should function as a way forward for Task Forces.
- UZ, MW, GA, VJV, VK, SB, JK, SG, KG - volunteered to come up with/discuss the proposition.

Group 5:

The group agreed that Task Forces serve a dual purpose for Europeana:
1) they are the way for the Network to influence Europeana's operation, policy, strategy and direction;
2)  they are a method of Europeana to fulfil requirements of the Business Plan and DSI Tender.

It is the sole jurisdiction of the MC to evaluate, approve, or reject them. The current process for proposing and approving the Task Forces is not completely fit for purpose. According to the group, there are the following issues:

- Task Force proposals are only submitted twice a year and the proposals are of mixed quality and quantity
- The MC is not in a position to satisfactory evaluate the (implementation of their) results
- There is no proper accountability of the budget for Task Forces
- The need for Task Forces does not adjoin with the timing of an MC meetings
- Delivery of reports and evaluation process need to be substantially improved.

The group agreed with a Committee that would be responsible for the process of setting up and approving the Task Forces, and evaluating their results. The Committee would facilitate the MC to allow for a proper process of decision making. It would not, however, make the decisions on MC's behalf. The Committee could consist of one MB member (UZ, chair), 2-3 MC members, and the Network Coordinator. Task Forces deliver midterm or final report to the MC latest 2 weeks before each MC meeting. The report would include an evaluation of the Office of how the Task Forces results may be implemented in Europeana's operation and policy. Task Forces that do not provide a report would not be allowed to spend money until the following MC meeting (Responsible: TF Chair, Accountable: MC member).

The following action points were derived from these discussions:

→ *to come up with a concrete proposal for a Task Force Evaluation Committee set-up to be consulted with UZ, MW, GA, VJ, VK, SB, JK, SG, KG, and put in practice by the first MC meeting of 2018.*
→ *to restructure the Task Force Terms of Reference and overall evaluation process, clarify criteria for their implementation and evaluation, and adjust their forms.*
→ *to consider the use of channels like Europeana newsletter and mailing lists to promote Task Force recommendations.*

# Appendix 2

## Discussion Paper on Network Participation Framework: Community structure

(Members Council meeting, Milan, 5 December 2017)

*This is a discussion paper prepared as a proposal document for MC meeting debate on ENA structure from 2018 onwards, based on findings and proposals of the Network Participation Framework Task Force*

The Network Participation Framework Task Force collected information and experience in several environments of ENA and Europeana landscape, where improvements can be made and would be beneficial to the participation of Network members. Several processes were looked at, problems identified, and suggestions collected for improvement in terms of governance structure of ENA, and rules for the functioning of its communities, Working Groups, and Task Forces.

One of the proposals for action/final recommendations of this Task Force is to make ENA function under a *community structure*, i.e. have a set of active Network communities formed around common interests and steered by Working Groups as core. The newly established Library Working Group has been proposed to be used as a test-case for this community concept.

### Why should we set-up communities?

Based on the Network Participation Framework TF recommendations, the Network can be reshaped around the '*communities*' *of interest*. Having such communities, gathering hundreds of Network members around a common area of interest, makes the Network membership more rewarding. It also builds on key ENA membership benefits - cross-domain, cross-topic and cross-country cooperation on all kinds of subjects that its members wish to raise. This, in turn, allows the Network to expand and work towards the goal of having a 'network of networks'.

### Categorization of communities and Working Groups: community structure & rules

When ENA members sign up, they can indicate their specific interest and expertise (Tech, IPR, library, audiovisual media, aggregation etc.) and thereby choose the community of main interest and participate in that community .

The **Working Groups** (WG) work on a long-term basis to address ongoing activities and issues of continuing relevance of the communities of the ENA. They consist of actively involved community members (up to 50 technical group of experts), who help ENA define the issues of importance, drive its agenda, and steer the larger community via various communication channels. These members, presumably having a working knowledge of the issues in their communities at stake, are invited to work on documents,. Each community will have a WG as a

representative body that leads the community, and makes sure that relevant subjects get discussed, consulted and approved (if necessary) by the community.

A **community** can have a lot of members (no limit) - these are the people that are kept informed via Pro website, via regular emails and newsletters, and can be mobilized on specific occasions for campaigns, to test products, etc. They don't need to engage in regular work flows unless asked to do so.

Communities can have their own organizational logic and a lightweight terms of reference clearly outlining their purpose within the ENA. They can function under flexible rules that would allow them to choose how to organise their work. The communities would also need to be approved by the MC and have a WG with MC representation to steer it. We already have Tech community, IPR community, and Library community, so other communities formed around specific domains (museums, archives, audiovisual etc.) could follow, based on need and unique position.

Each WG representing a community shall appoint contact persons in at least 2 roles: *community manager* and *MC liaison*, the latter who represents the group in the MC. The Pro website can be used as a communication tool, where the WG and its community has their own dedicated space that the Office would be in charge of (to ensure the consistency of Pro). The extent of support a community can expect from the Foundation shall be further specified and depends on need and ambition of the community. We do, however, expect this to be rather small.

*\* The proposed structure however does not imply that every WG necessarily needs to have a community around it - there will still be WGs functioning with less members and without communities, such as #AllezCulture or Governance WG.*

**Example of a community + Working Group setup: Library Working Group**

The proposed community structure and rules can be piloted with the [Library Working Group](#) and a connected community.

The main purpose of this WG is to facilitate a continued discussion on topics of relevance to libraries and library professionals represented in ENA and address any library-related Europeana activity or issue, such as aggregation of library content to Europeana, mapping of library metadata to EDM, use and reuse of library materials on Europeana, and engagement of libraries with Europeana. The actual scope of work will very much depend on preferences and priorities of the members. The Library WG will also provide an opportunity to give feedback on key Europeana documents, get involved in projects such as the "Rise of Literacy", and become a source of best practice, guidelines, white papers and other relevant information. The WG will be the first of its kind, set up to tackle the issues of importance to one distinct cultural heritage sector. It therefore has the capacity to create a vibrant and inclusive community of library professionals and a platform for engaged discussions – following example of Europeana Tech and Europeana IPR. The main communication channels of the WG will be the Basecamp, email

and newsletter, with most of the work being done virtually. External communication will be done via Pro. The community might have up to 400 who have indicated an interest in libraries during registration for ENA membership.

*Open discussion points for the MC breakout groups:*

→ What communities shall we have in place?
- topics (sector/subject)
- activities
- Delivered results / impact they should have for ENA

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Position of the Aggregator Forum**
The Aggregator Forum will continue functioning as a separate body outside ENA. It operates at organisational rather than individual level. These organisations allow the aggregators and Europeana interact on topics of mutual interest. It should ideally be a forum for itself, working as a ecommons, with possibly a more formal structure in place. People who work for aggregators can however also be part of ENA as individual professionals. As such they are free to form their own ENA community, and influence policy and operation of the Europeana, but any consultation with the aggregators (e.g. DEA revision) should be done formally via the Aggregators themselves,
In this way, the Network members represent Europeana in their own institutions/field of expertise and at the same time, have the opportunity to get more involved with Europeana itself.

# Summary of the discussions:
(Members Council meeting, Milan, 5 December 2017 – From the minutes)

*Summary of all the discussions on ENA structure and set-up:*

The structure of the democratic governance model should be used to strengthen community-building in the Network and provide incentives for its members to actively participate. How should the dialogue/engagement in the communities be fostered?
→ look at Wikipedia community as an example: the platform feels open and democratic, but it requires dedicated administrators and truly engaged and active contributors.

Each MB member can champion a key area/community defined by the Network (e.g. IPR, Tech, Impact, data quality). Such key areas should be interoperable and defined as 'a problem to solve' – challenges that all Network members share an interest in facing together across the sector. These communities should be based on diversity of interest, and related to professions,

or based on end-users/thematic channels/markets of Europeana. They should not necessarily reflect the generic sector-divisions:  it is obvious for libraries to have such communities, but not so much for others like archives – avoid doubling of communities created elsewhere outside Europeana.

Each MB member is responsible for creating a subgroup of interested Councillors and championing a key area. Each area should have a position paper specifying its achievements year by year. Councillors in the subgroup are responsible for sharing and advocating the activity in their networks. The subgroups should be rather small and connected. This should be a way to facilitate the community-building and a sense of belonging based on existing interests within ENA.

The following action points were derived from these discussions:

→ *Action 10: Europeana Office - to implement and facilitate the suggested community and Working Group structure of ENA based on  findings of the breakout group discussions.*
→ *Action 11: Europeana Office - to consider conducting a survey on what motivates members to become part of ENA and specific communities/Working Groups.*