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| **Minutes of the**  **FISH Terminology Working Group**  **25th November 2014, British Museum** | | |
| 1. | **Present:** Phil Carlisle (Chair), Paul Adams, Sally Carter (minutes), Julia Stribblehill,  Cath Malony, Kieron Niven, Gill Campbell, Sarah Orr, Richard Light,  **Apologies**: Isabel Holroyd, Peter McKeague, Marion Crick, Alex Bromley, Leanne McCafferty, Beth Brooke, Jenny Orme | |  |
| 2. | **Minutes of the last meeting**  **Points of Action:**   * Gill attended the Summer HER forum and raised the issue of Palaeolithic and Mesolithic terminology. This led to the e-conference which is reported under section 4. * Gill amended the Ecofacts list (see section 5) * Phil has worked on restructuring the Objects thesaurus and the new structure will be circulated after this meeting.   Richard wished it to be noted that he is not a contributor to the Getty Projects as reported in the minutes but was reporting on developments. | Phil |
| 3. | **Round table catch-up**  *Cath Malony announced that she will be retiring in the new year and this will be her last meeting. The Group extended their thanks to her for her long term involvement with the Thesaurus and wished her well for the future.*  Paul (English Heritage) – Durham HER want to use the ‘English Heritage and National Trust Resource Description Thesaurus’. This is not in regular usage so Paul has been updating it and cleaning it up. It will then be made available on the FISH site. (It lists controlled vocabulary for describing resources, both form and format.)  Julia (British Museum) – the British Museum DAM system went live last week and this has occupied most of Julia’s time. She also attended the CIDOC conference in September.    Sarah – there has been no interest from ALGAO so far on Sarah’s contact with the Integrated Public Sector Vocab (IPSV) list so no further progress has been made. There is a need to look at and improve existing ALGAO wordlists and Phil suggested setting up a SIG to oversee this work.  Sarah raised the issue of a lack of controlled vocabulary for MIDAS Heritage (sources/archive subject). The Group suggested that there are already controlled vocabs for subjects with a far greater scope than we need and it would be foolish to reinvent the wheel. It was agreed that the Library of Congress subject headings is a good example and is used by ADS. After discussion it was agreed that “subject” could be changed to “keyword” in MIDAS as part of the restructuring. Keywords can be added in multiples, separated by a semi-colon. If this was made optional and not mandatory, with guidance pointing users to the Library of Congress list, then the issue raised by Sarah would be resolved.  Richard – attended the Documentation Standards Working Group at CIDOC. The Group is starting work on a Museological Dictionary, the scope of which is still to be determined. <http://network.icom.museum/cidoc/working-groups/documentation-standards/>  In September Richard attended the MODES workshop. They are looking at developing a browser based version, to be tested by a project that is working on the old Hertfordshire simple name list. This will be designed for smaller, multi-type collections and linked to dbpedia for definitions. It could also be linked to the Object name thesaurus to ensure consistency and improve scope notes in the thesaurus.  Kieron (ADS) – is continuing to work with standards in ADS, including developments with SENESCHAL and OASIS/Herald.  ADS have released a UAV guide (Unmanned Aerial Vehicles) and this is starting to be used by Archaeological contractors.  Cath (Museum of London) – is moving toward getting a large backlog on line. She hopes that her post will be continued after her retirement and has encouraged Alex Bromley, her colleague at Museum of London, to attend in her place.  Sally (National Museum Wales) – hosted the FISH meeting at National Museum Cardiff, including presentations on data standards developments by cultural heritage organisations in Wales.  Gill (EH) – organised the FISHTWG e-conference on controlled vocab in the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic (this is looked at in detail under point 4 of the agenda).  Research Resources Project – looking at what people are using in the sector and identifying where the gaps are. This may impact on the work of this Group. It also looks at barriers to access. Julia raised the issue of crowdsourcing to overcome some of these barriers and mentioned Dan Pett’s work on Micropasts. Gill will pass this information on to the project. <http://micropasts.org/>  Phil (EH) – attended the International Terminology Working Group at the CIDOC conference. This Group is run by Getty and is looking at making all the Getty vocabs available as linked open data. They are also working on CONA – Cultural Object Name Authority File, which aims to give every cultural object a unique reference number!  A list of presentations given at the CIDOC conference can be found at the bottom of this page:  <http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/training.html> |  |
| 4. | **Labels, Lithics and Landforms e-conference on controlled vocabularies for Palaeolithic data**  Gill reported back on the e-conference. She has summarised each of the three sessions and the Group discussed them in detail.  The key points of our discussion are listed below.  Session One: Chronology   * **Start date** – push the start date back to a million (agreed by FISH TWG) * **Sub-divisions for Early, Lower and Middle Palaeolithic** were quite problematic. The option favoured by FISH TWG was:   Lower Palaeolithic = Early Lower  Late Lower  Middle Palaeolithic = Early Middle  Late Middle   * **Sub-divisions for the Upper Palaeolithic** met with general agreement and FISH TWG agreed to adopt the proposed division into Early Upper Palaeolithic and Late Upper Palaeolithic. * **Period terminology** – to avoid confusion it was agreed that we need to standardise the use of the terms Early/Earlier or Late/Later. FISH TWG will adopt EARLY and LATE. Following on from this decision, it was agreed that we will update the period list from Later Prehistoric to Late Prehistoric. * **Marine Isotopes** – it was agreed that we will take forward Marine Isotope stages but we will need to add scope notes to the marine isotope list to enable users to index with the correct Marine Isotope Stage. See the EH Report (Oct 2012) ‘Sites of Early Human Activity’ for a current mapping of MIS. <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/dssg-sites-early-human-activity/early-human-activity-ssg.pdf> * **Overlapping dates**. There was a lengthy discussion about the pros and cons of overlapping dates, including issues with searching across both date and period. It was agreed that we would have overlapping dates but that start and end dates can be modified as software dictates. * **Post-Glacial Holocene**. It was agreed that it would be useful to adopt the term HOLOCENE PREHISTORIC for items of uncertain Mesolithic to Roman date. We need to see how this will look in draft form to clarify how it will sit within the thesaurus structure. * It was agreed that we need to consult PAS to improve the consistency of terminology across the cultural heritage sector.   Session Two: Landforms and Sediments   * There was agreement that we need to edit some of the scope notes to clarify the differences between monument types and findspots. * We need to be able to differentiate between isolated stray finds and those that may indicate a broader settlement. * It was agreed that we needed further discussion before adopting any of the suggested new terms, preferably under the auspices of a working group on natural features. * Revisit Evidence terms once further work has been undertaken on the development of natural features terminology   Session Three: Artefacts   * It was agreed that we should pull together lithic terminology into a separate hierarchy within the Objects thesaurus, and that this work should be overseen by a TWG SIG. Francis Wenban-Smith has shown interest in running such a Group. * The scope notes need considerable improvement and clarification * The use of the word ‘celt’ is problematic. For indexing the Group favoured using ‘axe head’ and making celt a NPT * Terms cannot be deleted from the old thesaurus because they are already used in indexing. They have also been converted to linked data and we cannot delete concepts, although it is possible to link terms to a new label. It is possible to correct scope notes and build new hierarchies in the existing thesaurus. When we create a new version of the thesaurus we will be able to create a new structure. We will also be able to change scope notes to explain changes to concepts and suggest future deprecation of the term. * It was agreed that the PAS Guide by Clive Bond was a useful starting point and that the work of our Group will be able to improve the current guide, helping to create a good on-line resource. It was agreed that training in identifying objects and using these terminologies would be very helpful and something we should aim to provide through on-line guides etc.   **Actions**   * Jonathan Last to be asked if the sub-divisions for Early, Lower and Middle Palaeolithic are suitable. We will send a number of possible options, outlining our favourite option and asking for a decision. * Changes to be made to the sub-divisions for the Upper Palaeolithic and Early and Late to be adopted as preferred terms. * Create a list for Marine Isotope Stages with scope notes and this can then be sent around for comment. This will be mapped against broader period divisions. * The new term Holocene Prehistoric to be added to the thesaurus * Modify the scope notes listed under the revisions and clarifications section of Gill’s summary document (Section 2, page 6) * Set up a working group for terminology related to Natural Features and revisit. * Invite Francis Wenban-Smith to set up a Special Interest Group under FISHTWG to look at artefact terminology. This SIG would report back to the main Group * Gill will check and then publish detailed summaries from the e-conference, highlighting the decisions agreed in this meeting and the actions listed. | Phil / Gill  EH  Gill  EH  EH  Phil  Gill |
| 5. | **Ecofacts Candidate Terms**  Gill presented the list of terms previously discussed. Scope notes have now been added.  Action  The Group agreed that all the terms should be accepted and they will be incorporated into the thesaurus. | EH |
| 6. | **Heritage Data Governance**  This is the site where the cultural heritage linked data is published.  <http://www.heritagedata.org/blog/>  English Heritage (Historic England) have agreed to pay the hosting costs for this site. This will allow us to make all our UK Heritage data freely available. The site is not owned by EH or the Commissions but by FISH. However, because FISH is not a legal body it is unable to pay any costs, although it can continue to host the data.  All legal agreements will be documented through FISH meetings. Phil has been tasked with creating a Governance document for Heritage data and this document will be brought to the FISH TWG for sign-off. It will outline what is expected for those submitting data and how that data will be managed.  The long term plan is that the site will become a ‘one stop shop’ for all heritage terminologies.  From January 2015 the FISH weebly site will be superceded by Heritagedata.org. Candidate terms will still go to DSU at EH and will be added or debated at FISH TWG. Results of debates on vocabularies will be made available on the Heritage data site. The launch in January will be accompanied with full explanations of the new structure.  Initially it will concentrate on UK terminologies but it could host international terminologies in the future.  Richard raised the issue of licences. Phil has been advised by the University of South Wales that our licences are sufficient for linked data purposes.  Actions:   * Phil to write a Governance document for Heritgae.data.org and present to FISHTWG for sign off. | Phil |
| 7. | **Under-represented Heritage**  Tania continues to work on LGTB terminology within EH but no further developments have been reported from The National Archive. There has also been no reports of further progress on Intangible Heritage terminology from the Scottish Commission.  CIDOC are also working in the area of intangible heritage and any developments will be raised at future meeting of this Group. |  |
| 8. | **AOB**  No further business was reported |  |
| 9. | **Date and time of next meeting:**  The next meeting will be held in April 2015. The venue will be confirmed and may be Fort Cumberland or the British Museum. | |