**EC Face to Face Meeting**

**Nancy E. Gwinn, Constance Rinaldo, Jane Smith, Martin Kalfatovic, Carolyn Sheffield, Bianca Crowley, Grace Costantino**

**Action Items**

\* To help inform the writing of the next strategic plan, a report of accomplishments should be prepared and shared with the Membership. (Secretariat)

\*Carolyn to update the draft 2017-2019 budgets and justification. (add $15k for Sec & EC travel; in Justification, note Tech Meeting in 2017, Staff Meeting in 2018)

\*Write up proposal for increasing Affiliate Dues to $3,000 to send to Members with 2017 budget; to be voted on at Annual Meeting

\*Carolyn to send Jesus and Felix a Membership package and try to schedule a call with Connie (Connie will send their contact info); possibly also send to NH in Madrid and Crete

\*Connie to connect Japan Natural History and connect them with Tomoko

\*Carolyn to add Egypt technical development options to TAG agenda

\*Martin to add to the agenda for the Executive Session – do they have concerns about info being shared or having opportunities to share their input with us? Is the Structure of the Members’ Calls working?

\* Carolyn - Send clear breakdown of which meeting sessions at Annual are open to which Partners; i.e., Members Business Meeting = Members Only + Chair of Global Committee; also send out hotel list

\*EC to take up the Artworks recommendations and share with Members

\*EC to initiate discussion online with Members regarding expanding the EC to include two new offices. This would be a bylaws change and should be presented to Members and voted on; EC to put before the Members at the Meeting to finalize; in the meantime, EC will suggest to the Nominating Committee that they find 2 people willing to take on this role. Immediate Past Chair and Program Director serve as non-voting Members – so need 2 new.

\*Carolyn to connect Bianca with Singapore to identify communication technologies for remote participation in Annual Meeting

\*Agenda for Annual Meeting – check in on structure of calls, is it working?

\*Carolyn to add to Tech Call Agenda: for permissions titles, what would it take for BHL to include link in metadata to online only open access content? If we do this, we should ask for a link back to us.

\*For Susan Fraser’s final report – what sustainable things will enable this to maintain scale?

\*Susan F and Connie to come up with position descriptions based on Patrick and Mariah type positions; what work could be done in a year? Secretariat should also brainstorm on where help would be most needed

\*EC to include in the new strategic plan the goal to grow sustainably and think about supporting additional staff

\*Jane will work with Chris Sleep and NHM colleagues to identify what the real drop-dead dates are for shutting down BHL Europe

\*Send Martin a reminder to follow up with Neill from Toronto; NEG can help with reminding Larry Alford

\* MRK will send the whole package to McGill

\* MRK will ping Paul Westers at NAL to check on their status and plans

\*Anne-Lise – CAS to ask how many people you expect for breakfast?

\*Ask Members how they’d like to manage discussions with such a big group and getting input

\*Connie will ask Jim about who to contact/best way to continue conversations with Yale

\*Carolyn to ask Grace to send any testimonials from Big 12 areas, particularly Denver, Copenhangen, and Berlin

\*Carolyn to discuss proposed changes to agenda and anticipated attendees with Wai Yin and team on November 28

\*Jane and Martin to organize the Strategic Planning session of the Partners Meeting day

**EOL Report (Nancy)**

This year’s EOL meeting included a lot of discussion on plans for EOL’s 10 year anniversary the future of EOL. Maureen Kearney (SI-NMNH) was in attendance in part to learn more about how EOL fits into other biodiversity centers based out of NMNH. The current anniversary date is set for February 2018 when the third version of EOL will launch. They’ve received $200,000 from Lounsberry for the anniversary.

Bob reported on the EOL size and collection, number of webpages, and users per month (average 5 million visits in 2016?) Their collections are meant to be comprehensive including both living and extinct species. They are using a tool called Quantcast to analyze user demographics and report their largest user group was 18 and younger and the next largest group was 18-24. EOL is targeted at graduate level research.

As part of website redesign they are adding several new features and functions to better serve their research audience. They are adding capability to mine by traits, to to search by habitat and map data, to draw polygons and pull up species occurrence records. They also reported on a comparative taxonomic backbone that is being developed by GBIF and GenBank and Naturalis. Bob also presented on Editors.eol.org that would allow people to bring information together from different sources. They are working with Bibliotheca Alexandrina on the technical development, including 3 developers and 2 contractors. Youseff had said at one point there were 7 people working on it. BHL Egypt is scheduled to launch next month with full text search.

NSF DIBBS might be worth looking into again for BHL.

**Strategic Plan (Nancy led discussion with all)**

The 2015-2017 Plan was reviewed to ensure that we were on track with where we would like to be at this point.

Most objectives were on track including for ongoing work. For project-based work, some items were identified as complete such as consolidating the technical infrastructure at Smithsonian and implementing social media tools on the website. It is important to note that projects such as EABL and NDSR are making significant contributions to meeting some of our objectives.

A few recommendations for new objectives were also suggested. For example, under Goal 1 – ‘Ensuring integration of BHL content within the global biodiversity community’s research ecosystem,’ we may want to think about looking for new opportunities for integration especially in light of BHL version 2. Under Goal 2, ‘ BHL in a Box’ may require further research to determine extent of need for BHL users. Additionally, optimizing for mobile could be an important technical priority for meeting user needs.

Under Goal 3, measuring impacts and outcomes of outreach and usage can be very compelling for existing and potential partners and potential funders. Bianca is already looking into some options for integrating more detailed statistics into the Admin Dash or otherwise making them available to partners. We may want to reflect this in the next plan.

\*Action Item – To help inform the writing of the next strategic plan, a report of accomplishments should be prepared and shared with the Membership.

**Nancy, Connie, Jane, Martin, Carolyn**

**Finances**

CY2017 – 2019 Spending Plans were reviewed with some proposed changes, which Carolyn will integrate before sending to Members for their review. Change includes adding in Secretariat and EC travel. Meetings covered by the Dues budget in 2017 will include Annual Meeting and possibly a Tech Team meeting.

Additional details on projections are available in the Budget and Budget Justification documents.

Financial Outlook – assuming growth continues at projected rates, we have moderate carryover into each subsequent calendar year. We will aim to keep this at $45,000 from year to year. It is important to note that as we grow, some costs may increase as we get more Members (cost of hosting meetings; swag budgets).

Income generation

Discussion of potential foundations to approach, including:

Arnold

Sloan

Moore

MacArthur

Knight Foundation – community relations; they’re interested in locations where Knight was based which is covered by many BHL partners

Wellcome Trust

Are there any Indian and South Asian funding opportunities we could be looking at?

EU funding opportunities?

DISSCO is the big initiative right now

CETAF is another to coordinate with

Asia-based foundations also should be looked into

**Technical Development**

Review of the 2017 Technical Priorities

Website migration is complete! There are a few transitional things in the works, i.e., an https fix on dashboard

Implementing full text search – Tech Advisory Group is making great process. Defining what searching and faceting should look like which will inform how the indexes should be built. Timeline still influenced by some unknowns. One of first steps will be server purchase, which will involve about an 8 week turnaround before actual implementation can begin. In the meantime, requirements are being written up and some wireframes drafted.

On a related note, Martin spoke with Stinger Guala at GBIF about names and synonym searching that he has run over ITIS and sees opportunities for implementation with BHL; would enable users to search across synonyms.

KBART changes are scoped out for 2017 on Mike’s contract renewal. This enables BHL metadata to be used in Summon and other external discovery tools. Issue arose from a need for summary serial records which BHL doesn’t have.

In thinking about how BA might fit into BHL’s technical development, a development server could be set up and then Mike and Joel could port over to BHL on the behind-the-firewall servers. Could put together a package of things priced out to cover/be equivalent to Membership, probably over a five year period. Some of the first might be working on moving over global names. Could also be looking at the taxonomic backbone being developed by GBIF which could provide opportunities to link to GBIF the way we do to EOL.

BHL is currently a .NET setup. In thinking about short term development, that expertise will be important. Longer term, we will want to move away from that for BHL v2.0.

Action Item: Talk to TAG about Egypt and technical development options

**Global BHL Management**

**CETAF Report (Connie)**

CETAF sees itself very much as an umbrella organization

They’re prepared to help provide connections; they’re interested in putting together a workshop and are currently conducting a survey of their members to better understand where they are with things and what it is that they need.

Several partner prospects. Madrid for example is looking at needing a costly software revision to serve their content so BHL looks affordable by comparison. Contact is Felix. Also, Elizabeth Ray (sp?) from the Natural History Museum, which is part of the Spanish Natural Research Council, which sponsored CETAF.

So at least one Member and probably several Affiliate prospects, including Polish Museum of Natural History and the Crete NH Museum. Also, lots of small libraries.

It was also a great opportunity to help communicate what happened with BHL Europe and build understanding that the content is slowly but surely coming into BHL.

All told, meeting was very productive and Michele Price did a fabulous job chairing.

\*Carolyn to send Jesus and Felix a Membership package and try to schedule a call with Connie (Connie will send their contact info); possibly also send to NH in Madrid and Crete

**Global Committees**

What does the committee want to achieve over next 3 months before Meeting?

BHL Europe – how does this fit in? Several European partners coming on board but is it BHL Europe now or individual nation/states represented on the committee?

This is for the Committee to decide how to handle.

Could there be a perception that it is still very US centric?

There needs to be a way for Affiliates to have a voice

What if for the Chair of Committee, Membership was required for that office?

It’s important to give the full Global group a collective voice, separate from voice as Member or Affiliate.

There are cultural, logistical differences between regions. This provides a place for all of these ideas to come together for consideration.

In terms of planning for the meeting, we should plan for 20 people for the Global Meeting. Not all Members will want to go.

Anne-Lise – CAS to ask how many people you expect for breakfast?

What pre-discussions could happen before the face-to-face meeting? Representatives should have input beyond their own perspective.

**GBIF report**

BHL is considered key partner. Donald Hobern feels we have a lot to provide.

Representatives from Taiwan, Japan, Norway were interested in BHL participation.

There could also be a lead organization in Norway to serve as point of contact.

Overall, the GBIF meeting was a very good place for contacts.

October 1-4 2017 GBIF in Helsinki

**Day Two**

**Meeting Planning**

We’ll need to make it clear in the schedule which sessions of the Annual Meeting are open to Members Only and which are open to all.

What is best way for Affiliates to raise concerns?

The Business Meeting is Members only plus Anne-Liese as Chair of BHL Global Committee; Chair reports to Members’ Council.

So we can make exceptions for those in roles for representing groups/committees within BHL.

Does the EC need to grow to reflect the growing size of the consortium?

We could talk about governance issues at the Business Meeting

**Annual Meeting, will include:**

* BHL Global Committee Meeting
* Partners’ Meeting – Open to Members, Affiliates, Partners
* Members’ Business Meeting – Open to Members only, and Chair of Global Committee

We could start to apply this same model to Members’ Calls, i.e., include Anne-Lise on these as Chair of BHL Global Committee.

Members – how big can we be when the calls are no longer able to accommodate full discussion with everyone who may have something to contribute?

Sometimes lose time catching people up as they join late

\*Action Item - Something we’ll need to ask Members about, how to manage discussions with such a big group and getting input

What if we formed a larger EC, perhaps by adding Members at Large? They can make recommendations on things like artworks, Gemini, too many opinions without recommendations. Smaller subcommittees

Members only vote on big things, new Partners, Bylaws changes

\*Action Item – EC to take up the Artworks recommendations and share with the Members

How well are other methods of communication working?

Reporting out – if anything, might be sending too much info

Should we be concerned about info coming back to Secretariat? Do people feel they can reach out to us?

Liaisons – Martin was calling / checking in with Members once a year

Last year, everyone on EC each took a set.

This year, Martin has talked about half of the people.

\*Agenda topic for Executive Session – so do they have concerns about info being shared or having opportunities to share their input with us?

The Executive Committee could take on the role of collecting input from Affiliates and asking their input--what would convince an Affiliate to move to a full Member?

**Roles**

Secretary = Chair of the Membership Committee

Vice Chair = liaison to Global Committee; perhaps also the Affiliates liaison?

Members at Large = liaisons to everyone?

Videoconferencing – not so much for monthly calls. Might be worthwhile for Annual Meeting.

\*CAS to connect Bianca with Singapore on communication technologies

\*Agenda for Annual Meeting – check in on structure of calls, is it working?

**Content Development and Growth**

Link-outs to publishers’ content – this recently came up in relation to permissions. For example, a publisher is willing to let us include their open access content, perhaps to a certain date, but then after a certain date, the volumes are only available online. If we can’t ingest, why not link out?

This has been a philosophical issue in the past. CiteBank was viewed as somewhat confusing to users and therefore not entirely successful. It has also created some issues with broken links.

What if we established specific criteria, i.e., we would only point to open access content that users can view for free? Why not help point users to more content?

One concern to consider is-- How visible is that information going to be?

If we’re linking to newer tiles, would it show up in our metadata just as a link out?

We would need to create a place to store the link in the database. So it would be a change request and require some of Mike’s time. Possibly also some of Joel’s time to implement parallel change in Macaw.

Another to consider, if we point to their content, what is the incentive for them to let us include any of their content in BHL?

Collection Development Policy currently says we do not add new linkouts. We could do a few, according to the open access criteria, and if we find despite all the work that it is problematic, we could stop it. We would have to couch it as a pilot

The major benefit would be to serve as one stop shopping.

\*For permissions title, what would it take for Mike to make it possible in BHL to include link in metadata to online only open access content? If we do this, we should ask for a link back to us.

**What is the sustainability model for US contributors, post-EABL?**

What if all or many of those contributing institutions, later on, want to add more content? Even if they become Members and Affiliates, we would need additional resources. The help videos will be useful but even still we would need at least one more person to address and sustain that level of participation. We would need approx. $75k to bring on another person.

\*For Susan Fraser’s final report – what sustainable things will enable this to maintain scale?

Patrick’s coordination of Permissions has freed up Bianca to focus on Gemini. Once permissions come back to Bianca, how to parcel out some of that other work?

If our strategic goal is to grow, we may want to fund two positions on Dues – Developer, + one staff to distribute administrative workload; wouldn’t necessarily need to be based at SI.

\*Susan F and Connie to come up with position descriptions based on Patrick and Mariah type positions; what can be done in a given year?

In addition to collections, what other administrative duties would need additional support as we grow?

\*Putting this in new strategic plan to grow sustainably

**Coherent/Actionable plan for ingest of BHL Europe content**

It would be useful for the actionable plan for ingest of BHL Europe content to appoint a chair or someone to oversee the work – perhaps this is already Joe?

What are the goals for loading content—a certain amount by a certain date?

Do we work with the original providers? Focus on those who join as Members or Affiliates.

Need to get remainder off NH servers. Worst case, will be closed down by first quarter of 2017.

Perhaps we need to buy two more disks – real costs of those? Plus shipping?

Sounds like he needs 26 TB.

First step how much does it cost to get this? How much time do we have?

What contributors might be able to do? Theoretically, it would be great to organize an EABL for Europe… What about Jirka’s shop? He can at least be responsible for his own stuff. Would he be willing to provide resources for others as well?

Still needs to come through Bianca/Joe/Joel. Could there be an equivalent across the pond? Jirka is the lynchpin. Once Naturalis has done their content, we can ask our Partners, can you take on your stuff?

Need to set criteria; Need to be an Affiliate or Member for us to provide help. Need to communicate that this backlog is not our fault. We understand their concern but can’t afford to do it for them. They can become Member or Affiliate and then we can help. Also talking with Jirka to see if there is some help that could come out of their side. CETAF could potentially help organize, too.

At some point, on our visible information, manage expectations on where it is, and what is required to make that happen.

BHL Europe inventory – we could set up a ‘donate now to see this online!’

\*Jane will see what real drop dead dates are for shutting down BHL Europe

**Strategic Growth**

NEG met with the British Library. There are several reasons that have prevented them from moving forward with joining before now. To begin, there collections are not classified and organized by format not by subject. Reference staff have some expertise by subject. Digitization to date has been based on who willing to pay for.

They will probably join as an Affiliate.

NEG suggested Jane may be able to help orient

Jane might check in if we haven’t heard

Toronto is another one in the works. Carolyn will work with Martin to send reminders.

Conversations have been initiated with Yale. Museum Library is separate from University library, waiting to learn which should be the point of contact.

Susan Gibbons and Head of Peabody, maybe they can split costs and Yale be a Member.

\*Connie will ask Jim about who/how to contact at Yale

John Carter Brown is also on verge of becoming an Affiliate.

McGill, probably an Affiliate. They’re interested in Artworks

MRK saw Jen Riley at DLF, Colleen has asked status. MRK will send whole package to McGill.

NAL – MRK will ping Paul Westeros

 Southampton – doesn’t look promising

New Zealand – Auckland contact, through Mark Costello

Madrid – NH, Bot Gard, Polish NH, Crete

The Group of 12

* Denver\*
* Royal Ontario Museum
* Copenhagen\*
* Royal Belgian Institute for Natural Science
* Berlin\*

20 minute presentation

40 minutes to discuss, questions for us and them

MRK presentation, focus on outcomes and benefits of participation

Quotes from users

\*Ask Grace – Do we have any quotes from Berlin or other institutions, or their users?

**Strategic Plan**

What is our vision for next 10 years – where are we going?

One idea that recently resurfaced, the BHL Europe GRIB concept. Why not be the metadata repository for biodiversity literature? Like Web of Science in a way.

What about broadening scope? Earth sciences? And anthropology?

One thing that we learned in London is that our strength and one reason for our success has been that we have a core purpose.

K-12 could be a distraction.

How does indexing and abstracting fit into this? As things go behind paywalls, thinking about that, and funding opportunities. ZooTaxa – should we be indexing this for example? How does that change our staffing needs?

Linking out to those permissions titles as mentioned earlier.

Where do relationships between literature and specimens fit into our strategic goals? How do traits fit into BHL? What about conservation?

We also need to be cognizant about retaining funding for the core as we’re looking at will attract funding that is over above. For example, metadata and additional types or content, sciences.

Artworks/Visual Resources could be appealing to the Mellon Foundation

One of the primary objections has been that these “single page” don’t fit our model.

We could package Artworks with Version 2, that will be the carrot, the shiny piece.

NDSR residents will also be working on this over 2017. For strategic plan, seeking funding based on what the residents learn. Could begin the proposal process at the 6-9 month mark.

How do we want to approach the process of doing the new plan?

Strategic Plan Committee approach didn’t work out as planned.

At the Members’ Business Meeting, we could include a Workshop Brainstorming Session. We’ll need to look into table setup for breakout groups

Next Chair – could call on people to participate in setting strategic priorities

**Annual Meeting**

Carolyn took notes on the draft schedule chart and will connect with Wai Yin and team on November 28 to discuss options for desired changes.