**BHL Annual Meeting**

**Business Meeting, Field Museum**

**March 18, 2015**

**Action Items**

* Clarify procedures in the Operations Manual for future changes in Member/Affiliate status and ensure we have a paper trail. (Martin and Carolyn)
* Establish a process and procedure to ensure connection between Staff and Directors to help with Selection. (Martin and Bianca)
* Establish a procedure for people to apply for funds to travel to a Conference, for BHL related papers or other activities (Carolyn, Martin, and EC)
* For In-Kind Contributions, change name to BHL Contributions: Cash and In-Kind; delineate Member and Affiliate contributions; Add categories for temporary/part-time staff. Include Subvention in list of definitions (Carolyn)
* Follow up with Kelli on how to appropriately track contributions from UIUC (Carolyn and Martin)
* Share the SIL-BHL mini case statement with Members upon publication (Martin)
* Investigate how tabletop scanners fit into the Pan-BHL scanning contract. (Carolyn)
* Investigate option with IA of discount if several Members would like to purchase tabletop scribes. (Martin and Carolyn)
* Explore other methods to support institutional scanning (Martin and Carolyn)
* Send report for how much has been spent by each Member (Carolyn)
* Add Artworks in BHL to Projects & Initiatives (Bianca)
* Add Metrics & Statistics for collections and use to Projects & Initiatives (Bianca)
* Incorporate changes to strategic plan and send around to the Members for review. Final revisions will be made by the end of May 2015.
* BHL Annual Meeting 2016: Coordinate with global group to determine if joint meeting will be possible (Connie)
* Develop Affiliate Fee schedule (Affiliate Fee Committee)
* Look into possible May dates for the 2016 Annual Meeting (Jane)
* Benefits for Members & Affiliates (Connie and Jane)
  + Add Macaw implementation to Members list of benefits
  + Add hosting content to both

**Attending**

Members: Nancy E. Gwinn, Constance Rinaldo, Susan Fraser, Judy Warnement, Tom Baione, Tomoko Steen, Marty Schlabach, Jane Smith, Chris Mills, Eric Chin, Patricia Koleff, Kelli Trei, Christine Gianonni, Diane Rielinger, Doug Holland

BHL Staff: Martin R. Kalfatovic, William Ulate, Carolyn Sheffield, Grace Costantino, Bianca Crowley

Not Attending: Cate Canevari

**Votes**

Executive Committee Election [slate approved by voice vote]

- Nancy Gwinn (Chair)

- Constance Rinaldo (Vice-Chair)

- Jane Smith (Secretary)

2016 Annual Meeting [approved by secret paper ballot, 12 – 3]

- London (co-hosted by NHM and Kew)

- Exact dates and format of the meeting are TBD

Moving BHL Platform to SIL [approved unanimously]

Moving forward with Affiliate Fees [approved unanimously]

**Minutes**

**Review of votes and actions since last meeting**

For full list, see https://bhl.wikispaces.com/2015+BHL+Members+Meeting.

Additionally, at the recommendation of Membership Committee, EC accepted the proposal to move WUSTL and CAS from Members to Affiliates.

In the future, we will need to clarify procedures in the BHL Operations Manual for changes to status.  Under the new MOU, it will require a vote.

**Calendar Year 2014 Dues Spending Review**

Reviewed Dues Spending.  There were no questions.

**Calendar Year 2015 Spending Plan**

*Scanning*

As a follow-up to the low hanging fruit discussion on 3/17, those might really be only 1/3 or 1/2 of what is on tree. Some institutions early on, were fortunate enough to take advantage of funds that were available, others not so much. We need more of an effort to figure out what else is needed.  Gemini does this, but not everything is in there.  Some have identified pots of content that are ready to go.

One possibility would be that those who have the capacity to identify, can do so and then we could earmark some funds for the identified content.

Do we have a priority list?  How do we layer priorities?

BHL Staff all know anything within scope is fair game.  They also know the procedures for de-duping.  It’s up to the Institutions to select what they would like to scan for BHL.

We need to establish a process and procedure to ensure connection between Staff and Directors to help with Selection.

If we become overwhelmed with requests, we might need to up the priority of scanning on our budget.  Maybe there can be a sub-committee for identifying things across institutions.

For next year, if we want to make a “Big Splash” we could approach strategically to identify what content to prioritize, with a focus to draw from newer Members.

Could be helpful to ask your staff to report on their open Gemini issues.

Priority should still be given to funding scientists requests for scanning

*Meetings*

There is the possibility of a subvention for attending the Staff Meeting in November.  We would like to apply a token amount, tbd. We’ll need to establish a procedure for people to apply for funds to travel to a Conference, for an invited paper.

Dues Budget was already approved in principal. If no concerns, no need to vote again.

**Review of CY 2014 In-Kind Contributions**

Do all find this useful, interesting and valuable?

* It’s great!
* Difficult, but useful
* Useful for grant applications
* Useful to show administrations

There could be more categories — some don’t have volunteers or interns working on BHL but do have temporary and/or part-time folks filling a related role and would like to have a place to record that.

Is there a way to simplify the process? Some institutions encounter challenges with reporting.  UIUC, for example, could do it if appropriately trackable.

Change Name to:

BHL Contributions: Cash and In-Kind

Also, separate out Members and Affiliates and define Subvention at bottom.

**Collaborative Funding Opportunities**

At 2014 BHL Annual Meeting, we discussed different approaches to joint fundraising from philanthropic individuals or foundations. Found it was difficult to get Development Offices to work together since most institutions have very specific goals and needs and protected donor lists. Determined it will be most efficient to direct those kinds of funding within our own institutions.

For funding of projects and grants, it is still important to be collaborative.  We should all still talk to each other about what we’re going for.

The Kew Head of Development would be happy to work with others on grants, and travels to America frequently.  If there’s a botanical element, Kew and the other partner could go together to a funder, which might make more sense.

Would be interesting to know everyone’s overhead rate.  At SI, any private donation under $10,000 there is no IDC.  If over, then that is at around 10%.

**Non-IA Scanning Fund Options**

Currently, the Pan-BHL Scanning contract works only if you can get materials to an IA facility.  MOBOT, LC, Singapore, UIUC, Cornell, Mexico, have been unable to do that at this point.  Are there (feasible) ways that we can facilitate that are not IA?

Talked with Administrative Offices.  EOL has an MOU that alleviates the need for contracting vehicles.  For example, if MOBOT were to say they need $5k to scan and will deliver X number of pages.

We should avoiding viewing this as potential discounts on the Dues as we need to count on the amount of Dues revenue for budgeting purposes.

Some institutions have 4 different workflows. We want to make sure we maintain quality regardless of where scanned.

Would IA give us discounted bulk rate for table-top scribes?

Robert is interested in becoming Affiliate, would pay some fees or in-kind.

Is there a way to encourage post-digitization, curating collections, replacing missing pages for free?  Post is just as important.  Could follow the OCLC model of getting credits for correcting a record.

We’ll explore other methods to support institutional scanning and also look into how current Pan-BHL contract might address new IA tabletop scanners.

We’ll also send around a report on how much has been spent by each Member from the contract.

**Review of Draft Strategic Plan**

We’ll incorporate changes discussed during the review of the revised strategic plan and send around to the group.

**Technical Deep Dive**

Review of time and cost allocations for Technical Team through December 2015.  Going forward, there will be a funding gap in Calendar Year 2016 for supporting Technical Team on Dues.

**BHL Platform Development**

The BHL platform has been replicated to SIL servers in a .net environment with backup generators and a full copy of all content (currently about 70TB) served through BHL now copied over. Alleviates some of the issues with storms and technical infrastructure at MOBOT as SI can more easily absorb the $46,000 technical maintenance costs. Next step will be to extricate Admin module from the MOBOT and Botanicus authentication; Mike and Joel are working on that.

The target date is the end of June to have an operational system.

Then spend the rest of 2015 to complete the rest of the details needed for the migration (e.g., dns name server needs to be switched over etc.)

*Benefits*

Originally intended as a failover site but since we don’t have resources to afford both, we will instead use this as a more robust original site.

SIL was able to get the storage for free and Smithsonian will absorb this into operating storage.  These are virtual machines so not being charged for storage yet, though would like to add 30 TBs which will likely have a cost associated with it.  Similarly, EOL is transitioning its platform to SI.  Their’s is more complex with more traffic and so involved some costs to move.

We’ll need robust development environment in terms of what a 2016 version of the BHL platform would look like.

If when this happens should acknowledge all that MOBOT has done for us.

*Sustainability of IA*

IA is funded through Brewster Kale’s personal foundation and income from various projects. While we can’t comment on IA’s sustainability, IA will continue to be staging ground and we’ll still depend on them for the OCR, etc.

*Another possibility*

BHL could live in a cloud environment, though we don’t have budget for the foreseeable future. In other words, more than free, and you get what you pay for.

*Sustainability at SI*

View this as the long term sustainability plan.  It moves it into a supportive environment to ensure its long term existence.

Smithsonian is a trust instrumentality of United States. Even with government shutdown, websites were taken down at first but decision reversed after 15 minutes.

In terms of the library side and Secretariat, Nancy is obviously a strong advocate.  In the future, what is sustainability of salaries?  What happens if BHL is sitting at SI and SIL becomes unable to support secretariat?

At Smithsonian, buy-in for BHL does not stop with the Libraries.  Within the Institution, it is just a huge success story, including with everybody in Administration. We get important support from senior management the funding. BHL is part of what makes us, SIL, indispensable to the Institution.

Direct federal appropriation to support biodiversity-related work: $125,000.

Additionally, an internal endowment close to $400,000 comes to SIL, most goes to BHL stabilizing at $300k for five year periods.

**VOTE on move to SIL**

The Members voted to approve the move to SIL with no further discussion and none opposed.

**Executive Committee Election**

The Nominating Committee put forth the following candidate slate:

Nancy E. Gwinn, Chair

Constance Rinaldo, Vice Chair

Jane Smith, Secretary

The Members voted to approve the proposed slate with none opposed.

And a big "Thank you!” to Susan for the time she put in as Secretary!

**BHL Annual Meeting 2016: London**

NHM-London/Kew, Cornell, and Singapore proposed hosting the 2016 Meeting.  The Members voted by paper ballot to select London.

Possible dates include:

11 April week

And will look at mid-May and see if might work

**2016 BHL Annual Meeting, Conference Planning Committee**

Jane Smith

Chris Mills

Christine Giannoni

Tomoko Steen

Nancy E. Gwinn

Tom Baione

Martin Kalfatovic, ex officio

Carolyn Sheffield, ex officio

Connie will coordinate with the global group to explore the option of hosting a joint meeting.

**Membership Committee Report**

Committee includes: Judy, Tomoko, Jane, Connie, and Susan

In 2014, reviewed several applications:

*Affiliates*

BHL Africa

Chicago

*Member*

CONABIO

Yesterday WUSTL and CAS, grandfathered in as Affiliates after being Members.

As part of membership recruitment plans, Committee drafted letter of invitation and created a list of potential Members.  We are waiting to contact these institutions until the fees are discussed.

Beyond 30 Members, would it become unwieldy?  We currently have 16 Full Members, it may not be to our advantage to act as if we have a closed circle. If we reach 25, we may revisit. For the strategic plan, perhaps we don’t specify a number.

Should we consider automatically including Global Nodes as Affiliates?

How would that come about?  Don’t think we should make anything automatic with global.  Certainly an option that we could offer but each node is so individual.

Procedure as it’s been heretofore, you can’t just call yourself a node.

Theoretically proposes itself and approved by global coordinating committee.

Would it already have to be approved here? Technically not, as we don’t have to provide them any services.

Nodes perhaps ought to all be Affiliates.  Or at least going forward, choosing nodes that are prepared to be Affiliates. At first, it was unclear what an Affiliate was and now another creature called a node.  As a node, we sometimes feel that we are not a part of the BHL family but meant to be a part of family.

Ely Wallis has also expressed the same thing about not feeling a part of things.  As Chair of Global Coordinating Committee, Ely is also invited to the BHL Annual Meeting as an observer.

Nodes do also participate in global coordinating committee.

Egypt has recently expressed they feel they might become a paying Member. It may be that we slowly convert existing nodes to a Membership status.

We are in transitional situation. Bylaws do not state what a global node is. Perhaps if we could combine meetings it could improve the sense of inclusiveness.  Nodes were formed as partnerships of themselves.  With Singapore and Mexico, our partnership was formed with a single entity whereas with others it was a partnership with multiples.

Singapore became a node because it was natural to think of it this way because we need to bring all these institutions together.  Started by talking about regional organization and people around us were major content holders.  We felt like having a larger presence would be beneficial.  Could reach out better than any existing BHL consortium rep could.

CONABIO, also less of content holder and more of a partnership coordinator.

**Affiliate Fee Structure**

One reason looking at implementing a fee structure is that we’re looking at a deficit as early as next year (CY2016).

We’ve talked with some Affiliates about the possibility of fees.  Affiliates have selected that status because they want to be involved and are committed but don’t have funding for full Dues.  We’re hearing that they are willing to explore options for fees for specific services.  For example, certain activities related to getting content into BHL could be tied to fees.  Likewise, some institutions have indicated that they are unable to justify $10,000 but $1,000 or so annually could be justified. Others seem hopeful in advocating for the full Membership.

IA has also indicated an interest in becoming an Affiliate with the possibility of making some kind of financial or in-kind contribution.

Current proposal includes an annual administrative fee, and then cost recovery fees associated with a variety of services. How to figure out the cost recovery amount?

One benefit to add to the list is the hosting and providing access to digital content.

How do we translate that benefit to a fee for service?  What is the cost for hosting?

How do we balance our pursuit of content, beating the bushes to get content contributed, with the idea of requesting the content and then asking to be paid for including it in BHL?

Content is king. Seems contrary to turn around and charge for it, though great to add as a benefit.

We also need to consider the time it takes to teach people to massage their data, and to work with publishers for their content.

Further discussion may be needed on how to frame that as a cost recovery so is tabled for now.

Who would be compensated by the fees collected?

No one institution would be directly compensated; would go into the Dues pot.

After Affiliate status approved, Secretariat holds conference call with representative, lasts about 2 hours.  Provides background work on wiki, listservs, social media, etc.  We do the same thing for our new Members, so Affiliates are getting almost the same amount of work for free. Susan Lynch also helps folks out with Macaw and Joe from MCZ helps with some things.

If there is a fee structure, the benefits need to be significantly different.

We also want to be careful how we prioritize, keeping the focus on the urgency of the need and benefit to BHL as a whole over who paid more.

We’re all sitting here because want to make a difference. In some ways, requires an altruistic commitment, a la Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.

Significant differences currently include:

·      No access to contract vehicle for pan-BHL scanning fund

·      No access to travel funds

·      No voting rights

There needs to be a very clear delineation for sharing with Administrators.

Christine was able to advocate for full membership because one of key elements for the Field Museum has been their mission to share collections.  They would not be able to scan a single thing on their end and to have an opportunity to do so in a collaborative environment, really resonated administrators and leadership.

All of our administrations are going to see this through a different filter.  To some, it will be important to have participation on the governing team, others less so.

Even at institutions that have actively recruited annual giving to support similar missions, it can be very difficult to convince when they are being asked to pay from the other side of the table.

The takeaway is that the bigger and better this gets, the better the service to users. Being part of the governing body as a full Member means being able to inform the direction to provide better service to your users. We want to address this before we get lots of requests to become Affiliates.  If we decide to continue expanding the Affiliate program as is, we get nothing in return.

**VOTE on moving forward with Affiliates fees:**

A motion was made and seconded to move forward with the Affiliate fees.

Further discussion:

* How does this affect current affiliates? How they’ve come on board, they would have for 3 years term per MOU.  Theoretically we would be changing in middle of game.
* One thing to flesh out is what kind of questions we need to ask during this process?  Also, what HR implications are attached to applications?
* Macaw implementation, add to Members benefits

The Members then voted in favor of moving forward with none opposed.

**Affiliate Fees Committee:**

Constance Rinaldo, to convene

Jane Smith

Diane Rielinger

Eric Chin

**2016 Dues**

No changes.

**Members and Affiliates Stewardship**

“Buddy system" could be one model. One approach we’ve done in the past is to have EC call all Members and talk with them ahead of Dues invoice; Discuss how they’re doing, if able to renew.

We need a set group of things for orientation

Conference calls, expectation to join those

Introduction to standards in place

Macaw support

Demo of the structure of the BHL site

Discussion of ways to participate

Having a buddy system could also be advantageous because it is always good to have someone to follow up after follow-up after those conference calls, ask questions you may not have had a chance to ask or did not feel comfortable asking in front of entire group.