

# CIDOC Board meeting Minutes

**Time and location:** 9 September 2014 18h00 - 19h00, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Residenzschloss / Royal Palace  
**Attendees:** Nick Crofts, Emmanuelle Delmas-Glass, Dominik Remondino, Kaie Jeaser, Gabriel Bevilacqua, Martina Krug, Stephen Stead, Christian-Emil Ore, Jonathan Whitson Cloud, Erin Coburn, Regine Stein, Mika Nyman, Susanne Nickel, Walther Koch, Monika Hagedorn-Saupe, Günther Görz, Manvi Seth  
**Apologies:** Maija Ekosaari, Terry Nyambe  
**Minutes taken by:** Nick Crofts

**Agenda:**

1. Procedure for voting during the AGM (acceptance of budget and minutes)
2. Data harvesting and Interchange WG Change of name
3. Procedure for endorsement of standards/support for work of CRM SIG
4. Creation of CIDOC Training Association
5. Date for spring meeting

<b>A = Action / D = Decision / I = Information</b>		<b>Who</b>	<b>When</b>
<b>D</b>	<p><b>1. Procedure for voting during the AGM (acceptance of budget and minutes)</b>            A formal vote is needed during the AGM to accept the minutes of the previous AGM and to approve the financial report from the treasurer. NC proposes that a show of hands is sufficient (for, against, abstentions). Any non-CIDOC members (i.e. nonvoting observers) present in the room will be asked to refrain from voting. The procedure should not be a problem unless the results are contentious, which is unlikely.</p>		
<b>D</b>	<p><b>2. Data harvesting and Interchange WG Change of name</b>            The Data harvesting and interchange working group wishes to change its name to the LIDO working group. This new name better reflects the current focus of the group and may help to attract more members.</p>		
<b>I</b>	<p><b>3. Procedure for endorsement of standards/support for work of CRM SIG</b>            The CRM-SIG has asked for an expression of support from CIDOC concerning a number of work items, in particular:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 ) FRBRoo 2.0, endorsed by FRBR Review Group and the CRM-SIG</li> <li>2) PRESSoo, endorsed by FRBR Review Group and the CRM-SIG</li> </ol>		

	<p>3) CRM<sub>Marcho</sub>, ongoing work: (compatible extension of CRM)  4) CRM<sub>sci</sub>, ongoing work: (compatible extension of CRM)  5) Strategy for data provision, ongoing work: (endorsed by CRM-SIG as in the scope of the objectives of CRM-SIG)</p> <p>Christian-Emil points out that there are differences between points 1 &amp;2 and points 3-5. Issues 3-5 are “work in progress”, so formal endorsement is not needed at this stage (though the groups working on the harmonization may need a letter of support from the CIDOC Board). Issues 1 &amp; 2 <i>do</i> require formal endorsement.</p> <p>FRBRoo is the responsibility of the Working Group on FRBR/CRM Dialogue, which is one of the working groups appointed by the FRBR Review Group and works in cooperation with the CIDOC CRM SIG. PRESSoo is an extension of the FRBRoo model developed by the <i>Bibliothèque nationale de France</i> and the ISSN International Centre. The FRBR Review Group recently endorsed both models as valid ontologies for semantics relations in descriptions provided by libraries, while the CIDOC CRM SIG endorsed the two models in April 2014 as compatible extensions of CIDOC CRM.</p>		
<p><b>D</b></p> <p><b>I</b></p>	<p>This request raises the need for a clear operating procedure that will allow CIDOC to endorse normative documents developed by its working groups. At present, a decision by the AGM is the only formal mechanism through which CIDOC as a whole can make an endorsement. The board feels that it would not be appropriate to vote at the Dresden AGM on these questions. A decision taken in this way would be ill-informed and would lack credibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The board notes that IFLA is developing its own procedure for the formal endorsement of IFLA standards.</li> <li>• Günther Görz has suggested that any procedure put in place needs to be light-weight and relatively swift. He recommends the model used for W3C recommendations which has the advantage of making key documents available for use very quickly.</li> <li>• Susanne Nickel has proposed an outline procedure for accepting normative documents</li> </ul>		
<p><b>D</b></p>	<p>Combining the advantages of these approaches results in the following procedure:</p> <p><i>Step 1:</i> A CIDOC working group develops a normative document which it considers to be worthy of publication. The document is released by the WG, under its own authority, as a “Working Group draft recommendation”.</p> <p><i>Step 2:</i> At some point it becomes clear to the WG that the draft recommendation is relatively mature, stable and is being used. The WG makes the case to the CIDOC board that the document should be submitted for acceptance as a CIDOC recommendation. If the board agrees, the document becomes a “CIDOC draft recommendation”.</p> <p><i>Step 3:</i> The CIDOC board organizes a ballot of the CIDOC membership. This ballot period lasts several months. During the ballot period, CIDOC members are invited to vote on whether the draft document should be recognized as a CIDOC recommendation and to submit comments.</p>		

	<p><i>Step 4: At the end of the ballot, the CIDOC board decides on whether or not to accept the document (on the basis of stability, maturity and acceptance by the community). The document then becomes a “CIDOC recommendation”.</i></p> <p>Step four is the final step. The board agrees that CIDOC will issue “Recommendations” rather than “Standards”. Submission to ISO is the preferred mechanism for the preparation and adoptions of standards.</p> <p><i>The board accepts this outline procedure while noting that it requires further elaboration.</i></p>		
<b>D</b>	Expressed in terms of this foregoing, we are now at Step 2 with respect the CRM SIG request. The CRM SIG has effectively released FRBRoo 2.0 and PRESSoo as WG draft recommendations and is now requesting formal endorsement so that they become CIDOC recommendations.		
<b>A</b>	The board agrees to this request. FRBRoo 2.0 and PRESSoo thus have the status of <i>CIDOC draft recommendations</i> . This decision initiates the process for these two models to become CIDOC Recommendations. The board will submit the two draft documents for ballot by the CIDOC membership.	Nick, Martin	Oct
	<b>4. Creation of CIDOC Training Association</b>		
<b>I</b>	The CIDOC Training Programme (aka the CIDOC Summer School) was very successful in 2014, but we are reaching the limit of our capacity to manage the event on a purely voluntary basis using the resources of the CIDOC board. There is considerable demand for expansion of the programme. The event organized in São Paolo was massively oversubscribed. Ninety students attended (divided into 3 streams), while over 100 remained on the waiting list. Additional classes are planned for 2015 in Belo Horizonte and Finland.		
<b>I</b>	Nick Crofts has prepared a proposal (distributed to the board by email) for the creation of an organisational structure responsible for the running and development of the CIDOC training programme.		
<b>D/A</b>	The board recognizes the need to create a structure specifically devoted to the administration of the CIDOC training programme and mandates the chair to pursue his proposal to establish a not-for-profit association, overseen by both the CIDOC board and our academic partner, the Museum of Texas Tech University.	Nick	2014
	<b>5. Date for spring meeting</b>		
<b>D</b>	No date was set for the next CIDOC board meeting due to lack of time. The date will be set during the next online meeting.		