

COST Action IS1310 Steering Group Meeting, Huygens Institute

Present: Thomas Stäcker, Gertjan Filarski, Thomas Wallnig, Elizabethanne Boran, Mustafa Dogan, Patricia Murrieta-Flores, Neil Jeffries, Azzurra Pini, Eero Hyvönen, Charles van den Heuvel, Vanda Anastácio, Arno Bosse, Howard Hotson. Meeting minutes compiled, reviewed and expanded by some follow-up developments by TW, HH and AB; status 2016-09-29.

Table of contents

- I H2020
 - I.1 Discussion of the EULO verdict
 - I.1.1 “Excellence” (scored 4/5)
 - I.1.2 “Impact” (scored 4/5)
 - I.2 Other funding opportunities
 - I.2.1 INFRADEV (planning/conception)
 - I.2.2 EINFRA (infrastructure)
 - I.2.3 Additional funding opportunities

- II Revision of WG agendas, discussion of STSM proposals
- III Revision of WG agendas
- IV Grant Period 4

I H2020

I.1 Discussion of the EULO verdicts

[FIRST DAY: 9/12]

AB used the abstract of the EULO application as a means to refresh our grasp of the proposal. **HH** led a close reading of the brief Evaluation Summary Report, which falls into two parts.

I.1.1 “Excellence” (marked 4/5)

Close reading of the text: some parts obscure; reviewer possibly not a native speaker of English. First half lists a series of requirements *met* by the EULO application. A reasonably good summary, but not precise: minor error is reference to 16th-19th centuries (clearly not a historian); larger misunderstanding is the statement that we are mainly “constructing large databases” (not much IT expertise either?!). Second part is critical, perhaps written at a second stage of the process in order to find reasons to discard the proposal. This includes the unjustified verdict that there are a “limited number of participants” in the project and that this is “detrimental to the wider European integration activities” (because we seem to be concentrated on W-Europe). This is a serious misreading of the application (given that we listed, as requested, 14 national research infrastructure partners in the text, comprising 11 EU member states), so HH and AB have requested an evaluation review, but the likelihood of an evaluation review boosting the overall score to 9/10 is low, especially given the more legitimate shortcomings discussed below.

Lessons learned from “excellence” verdict.

- *Selection process, readership and composition.* The selection process involved evaluating 93 proposals, apparently in just one week; probably in two stages. Reviews were drafted quickly, and should not be over-analysed. Reviews clearly not written exclusively by scholarly *or* technical experts. So applications need to be written very self-consciously for non-experts. This means departing from academics’ normal habit, and requires circulation to non-experts to ask for critical feedback. Reading by researchers in e.g. biological and physical sciences would be particularly valuable, given that the call is addressed to scientists in particular. More emphasis on “selling” the core ideas by developing more concrete use cases and cutting back on technical details.
- *Utility requires more emphasis.* What is the contemporary problem to which EULO is the solution? Increased efficiency could be emphasized more. Discoverability is another key word. We could reformulate the entire proposal as a means of addressing the acute need to start investing in infrastructure designed to help foster transnational European identities. In this case developing the implications for public outreach and educational curricula should be emphasized. Address potential of duplication of efforts/services. EHRI is a good example of engagement with the broader public. By contrast, our user community seems predetermined and therefore closed. We need to describe an iterative process of identifying needs and expanding users. Networking and training activities are important here.
- *Networking and training activities insufficiently developed.* We could easily have developed this further, but falsely assumed that our COST expertise would speak for itself. In addition to the dimensions covered in the first draft application, we need to develop a more iterative approach, drawing continuously on feedback from our community. This will address the criticism that training activities were handled as “complementary rather than mainstream”.

[BREAK]

I.1.2 “Impact” (marked 4/5).

Close reading. “Specific kind of data”: suggests that we are a niche community. “User-friendly searchable database”: we need to emphasize that how EULO is *not* merely a finding aid and to explicate clearly everything else that it is designed to do (“This will allow historians / librarians / non-expert users ...”). “Nevertheless the potential of duplication of services has not been sufficiently addressed”: the most opaque phrase in the review. Duplication with existing catalogues? With DARIAH/CLARIN (as in the previous paragraph)? A throwaway phrase? In any case, we need to explicitly itemize the services EULO provides which are not available elsewhere.

Options and next steps

- *Request for an evaluation review:* already submitted by AB & HH on the basis that the 11 EU member states listed in the required table on national research infrastructures were not considered in the reviewer’s comments. Schedule unclear. Outcome unlikely to gain 9/10 overall or to get us to Stage II. If successful, we now know how to re-write the core narrative. Writing the additional components organised around WG5 meeting in Wolfenbüttel, Feb. 2017.
- *Re-submitting to the same call:* probably March 2018 (UK NCP expects another e-Infrastructure Starting Community Call but timing unknown: we should check previous cycles). This would come at the end of the COST Action, giving us maximum experience and time for planning but no funding for meetings (which could be provided from other sources).
- *Process:* for future major funding bids, more time is needed to circulate for feedback. Once the text is polished, pieces can be developed as separate proposals. A two-page outline could be circulated in advance to potential partners and outsiders.
- *Other H2020 eINFRA applications:* problem that they might disqualify us from re-applying; does ESFRI-funding received disqualify us from applying as a Starting Community? We cannot apply for an Advanced Community grant if we have no SC grant. Question: what is the “same community”? AB: To be asked to the NCPs [see below]. GF: Exception: integration of SC and AC. AB: You can, however, get “advanced community” money *after* having received starting community money. They probably slice and dice by countries. GF: You can go directly into Advanced Community, but you have to be the only infrastructure “specialized infrastructures have to collaborate in one proposal” [AB / NB: *who won the advanced community grants?*]. HH: After 5y opening up to the rest of the humanities; but not now. The EULO “partners” were there because they had the IT skills – we need a broader list (AP: design). AB: Only partners listed in the initial, administrative section of the proposal can receive funding; we wanted to add other partners while preparing stage II. HH: Going to Brussels for clarity does not really help. TS: We have to urge them to contradict us that we are the same community. [N.B. After the meeting, AB received clear feedback from the UK National Contact Point: We can apply for other H2020 grants now without disqualifying ourselves for potential ‘starting community’ calls in 2018. You are only excluded from this call after you have already received it once already – in other words, you can’t be a ‘starting community’ recipient twice].
- *Fund individual components separately:* The EULO proposal implicitly contains many different components. Even more will be developed in the RRL book. It will in fact be impossible to do all of this work even with two successive grants of Euro 5M. each. A re-submitted application will be much stronger if some of these components have already been built or are being funded separately. Moreover, some components could be built with smaller grants from national funding agencies. Hence the importance of the general framework laid out in the book. This strengthens the narrative for individual components: a European network is working on components which will eventually be integrated, and EU funding is needed to integrate them. Bilateral funding would be very valuable, as would alternative international funding like Marie Curie Training Schemes and Interreg. A two-page manifesto in the style of the MoU could be

useful in informing all the funding agencies. Popular history articles another option. A different narrative may be needed for technical communities not linked to history, but constructing relevant tools, distributive infrastructure, etc. We should also network with the 29% of eINFRA applications who reached Stage II (which could include the few partners who did wish to work with us previously, due to competing bids).

[LUNCH BREAK]

I.2 Other funding opportunities.

[Incipit later addition. Following the meeting, and taking up suggestions by TW and TS, AB researched the H2020 database and identified the following four potentially relevant calls and grants for 2017:

- (most likely candidate for re-submitting EULO)
Call: “Understanding Europe - Promoting the European Public and Cultural Space”
Scene Setter and updates: <http://tinyurl.com/j6kqz8a>
Topic: “European cultural heritage, access and analysis for a richer interpretation of the past” (cult-coop).
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/cult-coop-09-2017.html>
February & September 2017, two-stage, €2–3M
- (a planning grant, not an implementation grant)
Call: “Development and Long-Term Sustainability of new Pan-European Research Infrastructures” Scene Setter and updates: <http://tinyurl.com/jm3cbgg>
Topic: “Design Studies” (infra-dev)
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/infradev-01-2017.html>
March 2017, single-stage, €1–3M
- (two potential infrastructure calls)
Call: “E-Infrastructures”
Scene Setter and updates: <http://tinyurl.com/hbn9y59>
 - a) Topic: “Data and Distributed Computing e-infrastructures for Open Science” (einfra-12-2017)
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/einfra-12-2017.html>
March 2017, single-stage, €4–5M?
 - b) Topic: “Platform-driven e-infrastructure innovation” (einfra-21-2017)
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/einfra-21-2017.html>
March 2017, single-stage, €4–5M?

Important: of the calls above, identified after the meeting, only (2) (INFRADEV-01-2017) and (3b) (EINFRA-21-2017) were discussed in The Hague. Explicit later addition.]

I.2.1 INFRADEV-01-2017

€3M single stage 2017. Aim: Support the conceptual and technical design for new research infrastructures which are of a clear European dimension and interest, that cannot be funded by other means. Should address “all key questions”; design studies showcase “the maturity of the concept” – while at the same time being for the next generations. Will present “major choices for design alternatives and associated cost ranges” – provide options for policy-makers. Impact: Funding bodies will become aware of the strategic and funding needs (is not implementation and funding); sound decision basis for c. 5y. “Cross-cutting priorities: socio-economic sciences and

humanities". => People preparing are not *necessarily* in the SSH, but if not, *must* include SSH as partners or will receive a low mark. – A planning grant, not just technical aspects, but all conceptual aspects; addressing something that does not exist (= not addressed by the calls), needs to provide funders with choices. Arguing for your infrastructure outside your community.

Discussion. CvdH: How does that relate to the national funding schemes? AB: Call says: you should start convincing your country – proposed infrastructure should be broadly relevant and fundable at national, EU and international level. GF: Brick-and-mortar? AB: Types of activities (architecture and engineering plans...) listed do suggest this, however UK NCP says a physical infrastructure is not needed. The UK NCP will confirm [this was subsequently confirmed after the meeting]. HH: This seems to be addressing 100m projects. AB: Detailed call documents with suggested budget per project will be published with the opening of the call.

Prosopographical suggestion GF / discussion. GF: Aim to think about marrying biographical (text-based) and prosopographical (social-science) approaches – build an infrastructure. Huygens is *thinking* about a proposal, but not sure if this is the right call for us. EH: 'Digging into Data' in a similar direction. GF: National biographies of Europe inc. prosopographical datasets; synthetic/collective biography of groups with scarce data, say "bakers". AB Challenges: Scope – need to point to a significant lack, needs to be relevant to a larger group of people. CF: We have to get very general to address the call. PMF: What about the call, "Religious diversity in Europe" (Societal Challenges)? TW: This is a proposal about Austrian "regular people" – data management plan. Qualitative biography is also built on raw data. HH: Danger of biography/prosopography as tangential to EULO. MD: Challenge: what is not there already? AB: Problem here to identify a really *new* conception. HH One possible reading of the Call: Europe needs to keep up with China and US – hence you look at the 10-15y time. Uphill battle. Need to find a problem that Europe has to resolve. Can we scope out a serious European problem for 0,5m? National biographies: Canon of culture heroes – definition in contradistinction of each other. TW: Another possible idea, genetic data? NJ: Could mean trillions or more triples – a store for that does not exist.

[BREAK]

1.2.2 EINFRA-21-2017

€5M, single stage (March 2017). Scope b1. Universal discoverability of data objects and provenance. "Prototyping an e-infrastructure service for the uptake of a Digital Identifier e-infrastructure for digital objects, which cuts across ..." "Requirements of all stakeholder groups should be addressed" (roughly our groups). Impact: not just discoverability, but also provenance. Cultural organizations. – Challenges: (a) a working DOI infrastructure is just one part of EULO – how much EULO work before/after DOI can be included? (b) TRL6 (beta quality) before start of project and at least TRL8 (production quality) by end. Aim: Services should be designed and piloted with "supply and demand-side of most demanding cases" HPC (high-performance computing) language spilling over into the 'data and provenance' section. The topic description is a little sloppily written. GF: EULO => EINFRA, and Prosopography => INFRADEV is one possibility. Also here: integrating ESFRI activity. NJ: Broader, more general. As if "written for" THOR – identifier framework; we could fit a small part of EULO into that. Would it be worthwhile? This is only about giving things an identifier and sticking them into a search engine. TS: Contribute / collaborate, but we are not really in the position to develop an identifier scheme. NJ: We would be a use case, but should not be the lead partner. Provenance element is not very strong in THOR (comes out of libraries) – this could be the area of not addressing THOR alone.

MD: Call text does not talk about provenance; SUB is involved in provenance development, dataset partner – interconnection with EULO would be interesting. Several use cases – we could be one of

them. CvdH: Provenance: one could also think about a legal use case. EAB: Sure that being a use case will not preclude our chances for the next SC Grant call? AB: Will be checked with NCP [AB: this was subsequently cleared-up by UK NCP. It will not preclude our chances]. NJ: EMLO / CofK can be use case, too.

I.2.3 Other funding opportunities

PMF: H2020: Contemporary histories of Europe and Religious diversities – past/present/future: <http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/cult-co-op-04-2017.html>;
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/cult-co-op-05-2017.html>.

VA: Intelligent strategic development plans for each country should be considered. AP: successful proposal of Density Design was in PF7 under „Science and Society“. TW: Interreg – Slack. HH: Marie Curie Training Network; CvdH: far away from the infrastructure, but could be addressed in the book. TS: European Cultural Heritage
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/cult-co-op-09-2017.html>

[END OF FIRST DAY: 9/12]

II Revision of WG agendas, discussion of STSM proposals

[SECOND DAY: 9/13. Additional participant: Paolo Ciuccarelli.]

Revision WG agendas and STSM proposals. (the revised agendas are here: https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/1667511/Warsaw_WG_agendas.zip). Interrelation between revised WG agendas / volume / STSMs. The scope is to reflect on priorities; changes are not mandatory.

- **WG4:** EAB goes through the slides. HH: Physical characteristics: “signed sealed & undelivered” group interested. MD: Georg Thomas von Asch - project in Göttingen builds a generic data model for collection objects incl. [\http://asch.wiki.gwdg.de/index.php/Main_Page And the link describing the assessment of the evidences (letters): <http://asch.wiki.gwdg.de/index.php/Evidences> Stefanie Rühle has the project lead for further questions: <https://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/en/contact/staff-a-z/staff-details/person/stefanie-ruehle/>]; CvdH: Henk Nellen intervened in a meeting on that topic. EAB: further STSMs to go into Zotero, interested in Spain (=> Antonio Davila Perez). CvdH: Also feed that into the Malta agenda. EAB: Fine with this agenda.
- **WG3:** CvdH goes through slides, with feedback from Ciuccarelli, Stäcker and Urbánek. Problems: not many people interested in digital editions. Still seemingly Western European bias in content. Need: preparation of the conference, inviting people (Stylometrics); continuation of collaboration Readersbench-Epistolarium-Comenius; annotation - organization of workflows. First of all review of state of the art (e.g. DiXit conference in Antwerp; digital editions conference in Graz, and TEI conference in Vienna). TS: Demand by scholarly community to dive into digital editions, but still some reservations by the “traditional” scholars. Could be done in the context of a training school (with TEI). AB: DiXiT training schools [New open-access publication on this topic, “Digital Scholarly Editing”, edited by. Elena Pierazzo / Matthew James Driscoll]. NJ: IIf models for TEI coming out. CvdH: Could be part of

Malta. MD: We should train people to use machine-readable formats - independent from the existing scheme. TS: Digital edition is a good way to teach the digital. NJ: Produce videos / webinars. AB: Sceptical, because takes time to edit. HH: What we need - papers on pros and cons of different approaches - TEI / text as graph? CvdH: Better would be training. TW: For the book: provide background to individual approaches. CvdH: Cooperation with DiXiT - AB will be at 'Digital Scholarly Interfaces' DiXiT conference in Graz, Sept. 23-24th.

- **WG6:** Agenda is tied to the other WGs, PC wants to write this up, but for this needs a clear notion of what the other WGs are up to. HH: Como turning point, if we want to do this again, we need to plan and budget it. EAB: WG4 members profited a lot. TW: Good distance Como - Warsaw; could be repeated. HH: Could also integrate the WG agendas. CvdH: Thematic organization instead of WG structure.

[BREAK]

- **WG1.** PMF: Continue collaboration with Ruth Whelan, but also STSM Won: work with EMLO / Hartlib. Patterns of academic mobility. Problem had been: time and money to get work done. Attempts at grants. Together with WG4: Spatial and temporal dimension of metadata. Definition of a clearer strategy to identify place names in texts (neural networks) - only one large gazetteer? Or more? Partnership with WG6: means of visualizing spatial data, challenge: time. Definition of that in November - identification of material etc. EH: "Gallery notion" useful, should be done by all ; HH: also relevant work of Alexander Butterworth - Alexander Tessier; CvdH: also Mikkel Munthe Jensen. AB: Priority gazetteer? PMF: Same things also addressed in other EH: Cooperation with Leif Isaaksen? STSM? CvdH: Geographical name variants in Epistolarium. PMF: Neural networks to pin down place names in texts. TW: What about historical maps? EH: Service for cartographic services: <http://seco.cs.aalto.fi/projects/histoplaces/en/>; <http://hipla.fi> AB: "Transkribus for Maps". NJ: Crowdsourced geo-rectification tool. AB: Neuronal networks work on images as well.

Deadline for revisions to WG agendas - if deemed necessary - by 30.9.

STSM proposals. Only four applications had been submitted. Three were from ESRs applying for the first time, who had tailored their applications to the core agendas of the WGs. A fourth proposal, was from a more senior scholar who had previously had an STSM, was not closely tied to core agendas. The selection panel (the STSM Coordinator, Chair and Vice-Chair) recommended funding the three ESRs (Aspaas, Perez, Won; one woman, one inclusiveness). The Steering Group agreed to authorize these awards. Won's proposal may be topped up by Cultures of Knowledge to allow a one-month visit to Chester.

Budget overview Grant Period 3. until 30/4/17. Underspend from Warsaw: 10,000-15.000 (can be reallocated by e-vote). remainder of STS< budget: 8,100.

Budget overview Grant Period 4. 1/5/17 - 28/4/18. Sum available: c. 140,000-170,000. Malta conference: c. 50/60.000; 3GP.

III RRL volume(s).

General principles. Bringing our entire vision together into a finite and enduring hardcopy form is now a fixed desideratum: a summary of our unique discussions over four years can provide a point of reference and departure for future work across a huge field. Our entire vision embraces

conceptual, technical, methodological, scholarly and historiographical components; this cannot be neatly divided into technical and historiographical volumes. Covering all of these aspects in a single volume requires two things. All contributions must be written in language which non-experts can fully comprehend and at roughly the same scale and pace: we will pause to explain ‘republic of letters’ with the same care and patience as ‘linked open data’. The pace must be relatively brisk. If we envisage a volume consisting of roughly twelve main chapters (one for each half of the six WGs) plus a substantial introduction, then sections averaging 10,000 words each will produce a large volume of c. 150,000 words. If at least half of these twelve chapters is devoted to conceptual, technical, and methodological questions, this will leave less than 5,000 for scholarly and historiographical illustrations. Given the range of technical issues discussed, we will normally need to include multiple illustrations, reducing the space devoted to each; and space will also be needed to expound these illustrations in language which non-experts can understand. In other words, neither the technical nor the scholarly parts of the volume will include full-scale academic papers. If we as a community also want to develop fully-fledged papers illustrating the fruits of our methodological discussion at length, we will need to publish them elsewhere (see further below: *Associated publications*).

Introduction, structure, collaboratively-written content. A carefully articulated outline will be developed and circulated for comment. The starting point will be the structure of the Action itself (space, time, people, networks, texts, topics, documents, collections, data exchange, etc). This will ensure that most of the text will be crowd-sourced in the sense that it will emerge from our discussions over the four-year lifetime of the Action: individuals will contribute the material pertaining most closely to themselves, and small groups will report on collaborative work. Much of the basis of it will be provided by already-existing text. The introduction, for instance, will derive from the tried and tested format of the Memorandum of Understanding, as elaborated by numerous presentations developed of the Action as a whole. Where needed, these texts will be elaborated collaboratively. For instance, in outlining existing enterprises in the field, we will commission brief accounts of Kalliope, CEN, EMLO, e-manuscripta, the ePistolarium, EE, etc., from the individual institutions and projects concerned. Since individual contributions even of a single page will be provided with sub-headings and ascribed to their authors, the texture of the text will be very different from a typical edited volume and very representative of our collaborative undertaking: indeed it is hard to imagine how such a text could be generated without a long-term structure discussion of the sort we have enjoyed. As well as speaking to the community, the book will speak for and from the community as well.

Associated publications. The main volume will accommodate few if any full-length scholarly articles, but full-length demonstrations of the potentially transformative nature of our work are nevertheless highly desirable. Rather than assembling such studies them in a separate book, we might want to propose one or more special issues of appropriate scholarly journals. In addition, scattering co-authored articles throughout journals in many different fields and languages would benefit the community as a whole, especially if they can be linked by reciprocal cross-reference to the mother volume. A third option is ‘thematic clusters’ of articles in multiple journals.

Enhanced publication. Given our increasing need for dynamic, full-colour, interactive visualisations, both the main book and the journal articles may need to be enhanced with digital material. Consideration should also be given to creating a digital showcase for this material, either on the publisher’s website, the Action website, the CofK website, or in some other future-proofed environment.

Timetable. HH and TW will develop a detailed draft table of contents (c. 10 pages) with provisional allocation of texts to authors. The Lisbon meeting (Nov. 2016) will be partly focussed on

scrutinizing this outline and agreeing on modifications, and partly on the related tasks of commissioning contributions, recruiting sub-editors (if any), placing material for the special issue and associated website, coordinating work on the website, and considering how this material should be presented and discussed in Malta. Advance drafts will be needed before Malta (end of January 2018), where they will be 'fine-tuned' through collective discussion. Final texts must be submitted by the end of the action (April 2018). The more mechanical aspects of the editorial process, including copy-editing, can be funded until September 2018. The volume should appear in late 2018 or early 2019.

Editorial arrangements. In the first stage. HH and TW will assume editorial responsibility for the volume. Consideration will also be given to devolving individual parts of the volume to sub-editors, and the editorial arrangements for any special issues or thematic clusters. The crowd-sourced nature of the volume will require more than the usual editorial intervention, in order to synthesize a very large number of relatively short contributions into a coherent and readable text. Contributors will need to anticipate in advance a greater modification of their drafts than would be expected in a normal article.

Publishing options. Requirements: (a) COST requires open access; (b) a hard-copy publication is important for recruitment to the volume and longevity of the results; (c) DH material also needs quick turn-around time; (d) 'enhanced publication' may require flexibility on the part of the publisher; and ideally (e) a digital humanities series. An offer is on the table from the [Göttingen University Press](#), which has (a) an innovative open access platform, (b) combined with print-on-demand, (c) quick publication times, and (d) the advantage of a responsive working relationship with a partner to the Action. Margo Bargheer contact person. AB will liaise about conditions and proposal.

[LUNCH BREAK]

IV Grant Period 4

How to structure the conference in Malta? (will be addressed at the Lisbon meeting. How to spend the rest of the money in GPs 3 and 4.

Training School (CvdH). An event of this kind is called for in the Memorandum of Understanding [http://www.republicofletters.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/COSTVademecum_v2.pdf p. 25]. Staging an event under this heading is convenient, since it allows us to reimburse participants in lump sums (which can be varied according to place of origin, seniority, etc.) and to remunerate teachers. The preferred event is less like a 'school' led by 'teachers' than a design sprint involving digital designers and scholars. Rather than replicating the successful event in Como (which arose from soliciting applications mostly from junior colleagues), this event might focus on two tasks. One is to design the workflow of digital editions (a key desideratum of a large constituency within the Action which has so far not been well served). The other is to work through an agenda for visualisation and data interaction design for the entire Action (Time, Space, People, Networks, Texts, Topics, Documents, Collections). a third possibility might be to enrich material for the volume and enhanced publication. The Working Groups could be choosing particular problems for study and selecting participants. *Timing:* ideally shortly before Malta; in practice the autumn term in Milan is extremely busy; so more manageable dates would be September or July 2017.

Meeting proposals

GP3: existing meetings:

- Lisbon, 17-18 Nov. 2017: The scope of the meeting will be the discussion of a pre-circulated 5-10p outline of the book with a detailed synopsis of the material already in place / the questions still to be addressed under each relevant heading ("Time", "Space", "People", "Networks"... with a more flexible handling of WGs 5 and 6). We would like to go through this document in a mixture of brainstorming and consolidation effort, and also talk about editorial tasks and responsibilities, and timelines. Other questions to be addressed will include the nature of the volume (enhanced / hybrid), the publisher (Göttingen University Press?), supplementary publication opportunities for scholarly materials (special issues of learned journals?), and, not least and in many ways connected to this, the Fourth Work and Budget plan, including plans for the Malta Conference and a final round of STSMs. Wolfenbüttel, 9-10 February 2018: possible H2020 stage II; possible EINFRA single-stage; possible DOI single-stage; possible first stage COOP. Define components that might be outsourced to the national funding level .

GP 3: proposed meetings

- Oxford would like an STSM or small meeting in November 2017 to bring together expertise related to an AHRC application fundamental to the historical gazetteer.
- WG1-2 could use a small meeting after the the STSM in November 2017 to consider the structure and content of an historical gazetteer. PMF will coordinate this s. Feb 2017.

GP 4: proposed meetings

- small editorial meeting for volume.
- series of mini-meetings for H2020 and other large-scale applications

STSM proposals

- GP3: general strategy. The SG/WGs should solicit and develop a range of proposals, more than can be funded within GP3. If funding is available at the end of the financial year, it could thereby be put to good use. If not, these can be rolled over to GP 4. Procedure: first send a draft to HH, VA and TW for comment; then have the candidate send full application materials to entire SG for expedited agreement.
 - GP3: proposals for further development
 - WG4: two STSMs needed to collect data on Spanish and Italian epistolaries. Nieves may be able to recruit the first, Justine Walden may be able to fill the second. alternatively Archilet could be involved.
 - WG4-5: a young librarian might be sent from Wolfenbüttel to go to Dublin to help devise means of collecting collection-level description
 - WG4-5: an STSM might be devoted to the problem of devising a crowdsourcing module to continue work on EROL
 - GP 4: general strategy. Arguably the fourth STSM call was too restricted by explicit reference to the WG agendas. In Lisbon we should consider whether to issue an open call, and then propose to massage some of the proposals into fundable shape.
- GP4: preliminary proposals for further development
- WG2-3: Antske Fokkens would be a good candidate for an STSM involving the uses of historical material extracted from sources, literature and reference works.
 - [During the WG4 meeting on 9/14, a suggestion was articulated by Isabel Matthews-Schlinzig, regarding description categories for letters].

[END OF MEETING]