



HEIRNET

FISH-HEIRNET

Minutes of the Spring Meeting, Waterhouse Square, London

10th June 2014, 11.00 – 15:00

Present: Gillian Grayson, EH (FISH Convenor), Dan Miles, EH (FISH Co-ordinator), Sarah Howard, CBA, Phil Carlisle, EH, Hugh Corley, IMSIG, Keith May, EH, Graham Tait, Devon CC, Catherine Hardman, ADS, Tanja Watson, EH, Sally Carter, NMW, Peter McKeague, RCAHMS, Paul Cripps, USW.

1. Welcome and Apologies

Apologies were received from Dan Pett, Donna Robinson, Isabel Carr, David Thomas.

2. Minutes of the Last Meeting

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

3. Actions from the Last FISH-HEIRNET Meeting

7.2.1 Action to look into accessing EH investigation reports. DM / KM

This was discussed in the meeting as this was an issue that affected a number of the stakeholders. DM said that EH were looking at the potential for using DOIs and that a meeting is being held on this. Ed Lee was leading on this for the Capacity Building Team in EH.

Action transferred to Ed Lee.

4. Matters Arising

No matters arising

5. TACOS feedback

SH gave some feedback on the TACOS event, including that received from delegates (22 out of 44 replies so far) on the physical and virtual event. She highlighted very positive feedback on the cafe style workshops, the very relevant themes and the high quality presentations (including videos). There were some issues with the venue facilities and IT, compatibility of Etherpads with tablets (suggestion to look at using RRC) and for the virtual delegates in particular, there were some issues with the

Etherpads and online communication. The twitter debate was very good and #tacos2014 trended on Twitter.

All discussed how future events could be improved, based on the good formula used at TACOS, eg. more discussion time, less speakers, better structured group moderation (more time required to train moderators), better organisation of the virtual event - more pre-event planning and work required. Use of twitter was discussed - though very successful, more discussion could have been generated and the use of a twitter scribe was suggested with a digest of tweets shown live on a projector during the event. Difficulties of enforcing people to use twitter in an informed way rather than tweeting fun - we don't want a twitter police.

KM raised the lack of Welsh involvement.

SH replied that David Thomas and Chris Martin were to attend but cancelled at the last minute.

A great success, just need to fine tune the process!

SH also gave feedback on the timetable for the next steps:

Feedback questionnaire open until mid July.

Summary report – end June.

Final report end of august for partner organisations comment.

Dissemination of report September 2014.

SH highlighted the need to disseminate the results of TACOS. Potential ideas could be presentations at HER Forum, FISH-HEIRNET November meeting, CAA Glasgow conference session.

TW said that the links to TACOS are now on the FISH website.

5.1 Action on SH to highlight TACOS to Welsh colleagues and get their input.

6. MIDAS Heritage – Updates and changes

PC introduced a proposal to revise Midas Heritage. The idea had been sounded out to EH members of FISH and PC circulated a proposal to be discussed by FISH at the meeting. The proposal was to strip back MIDAS Heritage to only include the recording and data management of monuments and landscapes with the recording of other information groups, e.g. artefacts and ecofacts, archival and geographical information, to be covered by other professional standards. He set out various recommendations as part of this. One of the drivers for these changes was the issues discovered by PC in his work looking at exporting data from AMIE with the MIDAS heritage xml schema.

Various elements of the proposal were discussed by FISH. All agreed that the standard and its xml schema needed to be thought of as one and therefore any development or changes required needed to be carried out to both.

A better definition and refocusing of MIDAS Heritage to be a “sites and monuments” standard was discussed, and its name could be changed to reflect this. It was agreed by all that more guidance on what the standard is and how to use it is required, which could also be updated to the IFP wiki site on historic environment recording procedures.

All agreed that a revision of MIDAS Heritage was required, however a number of the changes proposed would need a lot more investigation and thought. The principle of pairing it down was understood as was the linking to other professional standards, however removing some of the themes entirely may not be the way forward, as some elements necessary for monument recording may not be covered adequately in other standards (eg map depiction in UK GEMINI). It was also thought that hooks to tie into other standards were required to be maintained in Midas Heritage, eg for Spatial to link into UK GEMINI.

GT raised the issue over the “Artefacts and Ecofacts” information group, and whether there was another appropriate standard that could be used for historic environment data recording. The use of SPECTRUM was discussed but SC didn’t think this covered the requirements of the historic environment sector. Currently the object Information theme uses the same schema as monument, which causes issues – there may be the requirement to create an object standard that sits alongside MIDAS. There needs to be some work done on the potential disarticulation of object/artefact from MIDAS- potentially a case study to see the advantages/disadvantages of removing it from the schema – discussions with the PAS over this may be useful.

The maintenance or removal of the “Information Sources” information group was discussed and as with the “Artefacts and Ecofacts” group, more work is required on this.

The need to better define the term Heritage Asset in the Standard is required, potentially to tie it into the definition outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The addition of a new section called ‘Dataset Metadata’, covering system and dataset metadata was discussed and agreed it was a good idea.

The changes to the use of the word “themes” was discussed, and again it was decided more work was required to see how the terminology used by other standards.

PC also spoke about the various issues with the xml schema and how this is closely related to how the standard works and potential future changes – more work is required on the xml schema. A mapping of MIDAS Heritage to the CIDOC CRM would be very useful.

PC said that the sector should be looking at moving the standard on by looking at what we want for future historic environment data management systems to do and therefore building the standard for this.

GT said that the scope of the standard needs to be looked at in terms of what level do we record at – which will have an impact on IFP2.

After a lively discussion, it was decided that this was an important piece of work that should be developed as a project. It was agreed by all that further stakeholder involvement is required, for example the HER community and that any project to look at the changes and implement them will require a great deal of transparency and collaboration. There are potentially different interfaces that need to be identified and engaged with – eg the impact on the HER compliance profile.

A plan of action was proposed – PC and TW to rewrite the proposal to send to FISH Members for comment. This will then go the sector (eg through HER Forum) and a cross sector working group set up to develop and take forward a project to develop MIDAS Heritage.

- 6.1 Actions on PC and TW to rewrite the recommendation paper in light of the suggestions, changes and recommendations of this meeting.
- 6.2 Action on PC to send this updated proposal to FISH Members for comment
- 6.3 Action on DM to disseminate the proposal to FISH, HER Forum.
- 6.4 Action on PC and GT to establish a working group to begin planning how to take this forward as a project.
- 6.5 Action on GT to look into the potential impact of this on the HER compliance profile.
- 6.6 Action on PC and KM to look into mapping MIDAS Heritage to the CRM
- 6.7 Action on PC to contact Dan Pett of PAS about the artefact/object standard

7. FISH Terminology Working Group (FISHTWG)

PC gave a highlight report back from the previous FISH Terminology Working Group meeting. Representatives from the Victoria and Albert museum had joined FISH TWG. The group was looking at updating the object thesaurus.

FISH TWG is now discussing how to take forward a project to create the Thesaurus of Cultural Heritage. This is now possible as the SENESCHAL project tools have removed the previous barrier of a lack of equity across Scotland, Wales and England.

PC had sent out a project brief prior to the meeting. This is to be an umbrella thesaurus –with the potential to add images to concepts in a wiki like structure,, backed by URIs and linked data and existing on the Heritagedata website. One issue raised was the lack of an open source editing tool. PC said they were looking at various options – eg GINCO, – I3Mainz’s labelling system – and Collections Trust/Lexaurus vocabulary bank. Another possibility is to use the source code from EHKOS and provide it to the OS Community.

PCR provided two other examples of tools that could be useful - Symantec media wiki and Whiskii.

PC will be taking this forward to FISHTWG as a project brief as FISHTWG has agreed that there is a requirement. There is no imminent impact on software suppliers etc as it is not intended to replace current thesauri.

GT asked if the brief will cover linking thesauri with others.

PC confirmed this and said it will inform the monument strand of the new thesaurus.

PM still has questions over whether the single thesaurus will deal with all terms.

SC and PM 80/90% matching with EH thesaurus and the rest should be covered by concepts linking.

PC said the next steps was FISHTWG was to create a project initiation document.–

GG asked about funding.

PC replied at the moment it is covered as part of the work of FISHTWG but will advise FISH on whether this changes.

PM and CH said they are MEDIN accredited organisations therefore there may be a potential funding stream.

DM asked about potential for engaging with N Ireland and EIRE

PC replied datasets based on EH and are out of date.

PM will approach Northern Ireland.

CH is in Belfast – soon and asked if she could convey anything on behalf of FISH.

7.1 Action on PC to look at getting EHKOS source code from EH.

7.2 Action on PC to organise FISH TWG minutes and project proposal are disseminated and put on the FISH website.

7.3 Action on PM to bring this work to the attention of N Ireland heritage data sector.

8. BIAB

SH gave an update on BIAB. EH funding acquired for another 3 years - agreed priorities include cleaning and consolidating dataset. SH is discussing this with Uni of South Wales and the suggestion is to use Google Refine to clean up typologies etc. SH highlighted an issue that the CBA has lost its systems officer, therefore will need to bring in outside expertise or train SH.

SH also highlighted the requirement to replace the replace digital platform for BIAB - one option being explored is to use the ARCHES bibliographic module.

BIAB abstracting still going on, though only for hardcopy publications not digital titles.

User stats still the same. 1st April 2014, 10,200 users, BIAB is well indexed in Google. There are 100/150 hits per day, however changes to Google Analytics means there is some confusion over whether these stats indicate unique users or visits.

SH highlighted the need to look at OASIS ingest issues and that BIAB was also looking for new servers.

9. Websites

DM spoke about the fact that there are different Web sites for FISH (weebly and CBA hosted), FISH toolkit, Inscription, heritagedata etc and that there is a need to consolidate this and communicate to the sector the changes to be implemented. The existence of Inscription and its out of date information has been a long standing issue brought to FISH.

DM suggested that there needs to be a consolidation of the FISH web profile, by turning off Inscription and the CBA hosted FISH website, and bringing the weebly FISH website together with the Heritagedata.org site on the same platform so that they can run in parallel – similar to the past with FISH and Inscription.

Heritagedata.org will host the wordlists and linked data and FISH will be the community information and signposting website.

CH asked about the management and sustainability of heritagedata.org, particularly for maintaining the tools created by the SENESCHAL project.

PC said that EH Data Standards Unit and FISHTWG will be responsible for managing the website and are looking at any training requirements.

KM said that that the heritage data server is a commercial one with a mirror on Glamorgan servers suitably backing up the website. He is looking into the creation of a memorandum of understanding to be signed by EH and the Royal Commissions to manage the website and tools.

DM explained that FISH couldn't sign the memorandum as it is not a legal entity.

GT said that before the old websites come down, the new URLs and the move from weebly to wordpress for the FISH website should be done. All changes should be implemented and the sector informed in one go.

All agreed.

9.1 Action on DM to work with TW to clarify what the various websites are and urls, whose responsible for them etc with the aim to make definitive changes

9.2 Action on KM to confirm backup copies etc of heritagedata.org

9.3 Action to KM to continue to work on the memorandum and on GG to check with EH legal

9.4 Action on PM to send draft to his management for early comment to provide feedback on their requirements.

9.5 Action on DM and GG to talk to Ed Lee about FISH as a potential legal entity

9.6 Action on KM to sort out training on the management of heritagedata.org

10. Membership

All spoke about membership and any potential gaps in FISH membership.

GG introduced the email she had received from Rob Edwards, Chair of the HBSMR user group that asked for better representation of commercial software developers at FISH meetings. This proposal had been emailed to current FISH Members and the opportunity to discuss this was taken in the meeting.

It was decided that due to potential conflicts of interest between national organisations and commercial software providers and the potentially large number of sectoral companies that could therefore attend as members, that they could not become standing members of FISH.

However it was decided by all that a closer relationship and contact is needed. This could be through invitations for commercial software suppliers to give presentations or showcase relevant systems and developments etc to FISH; and a greater

engagement of these suppliers in the processes of developing FISH projects (eg MIDAS Heritage) through workshops/working groups in the future. It was recognised that FISH could benefit from their experience and knowledge.

- 10.1 Action on GG to invite Claire Foley and Manx Heritage
- 10.2 Action on GG to clarify BM involvement
- 10.3 Action on PC to invite Dominic Oldman to FISHTWG
- 10.4 Action on all to identify potential software providers from the historic environment and cultural heritage sector for future agenda items.

11. Reports from Contributing Organisations

ADS

CH told the meeting that ADS has implemented tools produced by the SENESCHAL project internally within ADS and is looking at using them as part of their uploading HER data to the Heritage Gateway, in OASIS etc..

ADS are also looking at using them for metadata generating tools – ie to be able to scan a document and pull out key metadata and then undertake text matching against the SENESCHAL tools.

12. AOB

GG and SC confirmed that the next FISH-HEIRNET strategic meeting will be held on 18th November at the National Museum of Wales.

On the agenda so far will be the results of the TACOS workshop and various presentations from Welsh organisations. Further agenda items are to be identified.

GT asked about Peat recording and whether HERs should be recording peat, who does record it and what guidance is there. One of the issues is who is actually responsible for looking after this information on peat – is this a national or local responsibility? PC said that there were talks going on in Fort Cumberland (EH science staff) about this and potentially using a cataloguing system arbodat. Further investigation is required on this.

PM said that in Scotland there was a database for wetland deposits – though it was static.

- 12.1 Action on PC to enquire about peat recording in EH.

GG informed the meeting that Isabel Carr was standing down as a member of FISH and thanked her for all her work over a number of years, including as FISH Convenor.

Appendix 1 Open Actions

No	Joint FISH/HEIRNET Meeting: 01 st November 2011	Owner	Notes
11.5.1	Action to look at previous discussion on this matter relating to licensing	KN	Open – CH has taken over this action.
No	Joint FISH/HEIRNET Technical meeting: 26 th April 2013	Owner	Notes
7.2.1	Action to look into accessing EH investigation reports.	DM / KM	Open – transferred to Ed Lee
No	Joint FISH/HEIRNET Technical meeting: 10 th June 2014	Owner	Notes
5.1	Action to highlight TACOS to Welsh colleagues and get their input.	SH	
6.1	Action to rewrite the recommendation paper in light of the suggestions, changes and recommendations of this meeting.	TW & PC	
6.2	Action to send this updated proposal to FIS Members for comment	PC & DM	
6.3	Action to disseminate the proposal to the sector eg FISH, HER Forum, ALGAO HE committee etc..	DM & GT	
6.4	Action to establish a working group to begin planning how to take this forward as a project	PC & GT	
6.5	Action to look into the potential impact of this on the HER compliance profile.	GT	
6.6	Action to look into mapping MIDAS Heri to the CRM	PC & KM	
6.7	Action contact Dan Pett of PAS about the artefact/object standard	PC	
7.1	Action to look at getting EHCOS source code from EH.	PC	
7.2	Action to organise FISHTWH minutes and project proposal are disseminated and put on the FISH website.	PC	
7.3	Action to bring this work to the attention of N Ireland heritage data sector.	PM	
9.1	Action to clarify what the various websites are, urls, owners etc.. in preparation for implementing the proposed changes to the websites	DM & TW	
9.2	Action to confirm backup copies etc of heritagedata.org	KM	
9.3	Action to continue to work on the memorandum and check with EH legal	KM & GG	

9.4	Action to send draft memorandum to RCAHMS management for early comment and feedback on their specific requirements.	PM	
9.5	Action to talk to Ed lee about FISH as a potential legal entity	DM & GG	
9.6	Action to sort out training on the management of heritagedata.org	KM	
10.1	Action to invite Claire Foley and Manx Heritage	GG	
10.2	Action to clarify BM involvement	GG	
10.3	Action to invite Dominic Oldman to FISHTWG	PC	
10.4	Action to identify potential software providers from the historic environment and cultural heritage sector for future agenda items.	All	
12.1	Action to enquire about peat recording in EH	PC	