



Minutes

Exploring and documenting diversity in nature

CETAF A.I.S.B.L

CETAF 36 General Meeting, 14th 15th October 2014

Natural History Museum of Vienna, Austria

Host

Naturhistorisches museum Wien



Venue

Natural History Museum |

Address

Burgring 7
1010 Vienna
Austria

Director:

Christian Koeberl

Contact person:

Ernst Vitek

Notes: Course of the meeting was according to the approved Agenda

Annexes:

- Agenda for CETAF 36
- Annexes to the Minutes (numbered 1 to 25)

Authors

Ana Casino (General Secretary), Bárbara Herrero (International Relations),
Michelle J. Price (CETAF Chair)

PARTICIPANTS (in alphabetical order): Gergely BABOCSAY (Hungarian Natural History Museum, Budapest), Luca BARTOLOZZI (Natural History Museum, Florence), Laurence BÉNICHOU (National Museum of Natural History, Paris), Walter BERENDSOHN (Botanical Garden and Botanical Museum, Dahlem-Berlin), Björn BERNING (Upper Austria State Museums - Biology Centre, Linz), Arne BJØRLYKKE (Natural History Museum, University of Oslo), Thierry BOURGOIN (National Museum of Natural History, Paris), Gábor CSORBA (Hungarian Natural History Museum, Budapest), Rogier DE KOK (Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew), Vanessa DEMANOFF (National Museum of Natural History, Paris),

Steven DESSEIN (Botanic Garden Meise), Javier DIEGUEZ-URIBEONDO (Royal Botanic Garden-CSIC, Madrid), Johanna EDER (Stuttgart State Museum of Natural History), Henrik ENGHOFF (Natural History Museum of Denmark, Copenhagen), Per ERICSON (Swedish Museum of Natural History, Stockholm), Jiří FRANK (National Museum of Natural History, Prague), Mario GARCÍA-PARIS (National Museum of Natural Sciences-CSIC, Madrid), Patrick GROOTAERT (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels), Anton GÜNTSCH (Botanical Garden and Botanical Museum Dahlem-Berlin), Michel GUIRAUD (National Museum of Natural History, Paris), Anna GUTTOVÁ (Slovak National Taxonomic Facility-NatAF, Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS) - Institute of Botany, Bratislava), Peter HAASE (Senckenberg Natural History Museum, Frankfurt), David HARRIS (Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh), Christoph HÄUSER (Natural History Museum, Berlin), Gerhard HAZSPRUNAR (Bavarian Natural History Collections, Munich), Olle HINTS (Estonian Academy of Sciences, Tallinn), Rob HUXLEY (Natural History Museum, London), Ulrich JÖGER (NORe Consortium, Hamburg), Jiří KVAČEK (National Museum of Natural History, Prague), Zoltán KORSÓS (Hungarian Natural History Museum, Budapest), Björn KRÖGER (Finnish Museum of Natural History, Helsinki), Pierre-André LOIZEAU (Conservatory and Botanical Gardens of the City of Geneva), Norman MACLEOD (Natural History Museum, London), Michael MALICKY (Upper Austria State Museums-Biology Centre, Linz), Karol MARHOLD (Slovak National Taxonomic Facility-NatAF, Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS) - Institute of Botany, Bratislava), Jean MARIAUX (Museum of Natural History of the City of Geneva), Koen MARTENS (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels), Fridtjof MEHLUM (Natural History Museum, University of Oslo), Patricia MERGEN (Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren), Eva-Maria NÄTZER (Bavarian Natural History Collections, Munich), Bengt OXELMAN (Göteborg Natural History Museum), Carole PALECO (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels), Beáta PAPP (Hungarian Natural History Museum, Budapest), Claes PERSSON (Göteborg Natural History Museum), Stephanie PIETSCH (Zoological Research Museum Alexander Koenig, Bonn), Camille PISANI (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels), Michelle PRICE (Conservatory and Botanical Gardens of the City of Geneva), Christiane QUAISSER (Natural History Museum, Berlin), Leif SCHULMAN (Finnish Museum of Natural History-LUOMUS, Helsinki), Erik SMETS (Naturalis Biodiversity Center, Leiden), Edo STLOUKAL (Slovak National Taxonomic Facility-NatAF, Comenius University - Faculty of Natural Sciences, Bratislava), Isabella VAN DE VELDE (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels), Ernst VITEK (Natural History Museum Vienna), Catherina VOREADOU (Natural History Museum of Crete).

From the General Secretariat: Ana CASINO, Bárbara HERRERO (hosted by RBINS, Brussels).

Invited Speakers: Eileen GRAHAM (SciCOLL Program Manager, Smithsonian Institute-Washington DC, USA) and Jacco KNOIJN (Creative-B Project Manager, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands).

New Members: Boyko GEORGIEV (Bulgarian Consortium)

Observers: Paulo GAMA MOTA (Science Museum, University of Coimbra, Portugal).

The CETAF 36 meeting was officially opened by Michelle J. Price, Chair of CETAF, at 13h15.

OPENING OF THE CETAF35 GENERAL MEETING

Welcome by Michelle J. Price - Chair of CETAF - with an overview of the aims and expected results of the CETAF 36 General Meeting (as outlined in the introduction to the CETAF36 Agenda). Christian Köbler was thanked for hosting the General Meeting and the pre-meeting guided tours.

WELCOME ADDRESS

Christian Köbler, Director of the Naturhistorisches Museum Wien, gave a welcome address to the CETAF General Meeting on behalf of the host institution.

1. Approval of the Agenda CETAF 36. The **Agenda** was voted on and approved (**Annex 1**).

2. Approval of the records of the previous meeting. The minutes from the CETAF35 meeting, held on 6th-7th May 2014 and hosted by the Natural History Museum, University of Oslo, Norway, were distributed to the CETAF membership on the 25th July 2014 together with the Agenda of CETAF36 and the Invitation to attend the current meeting. The **CETAF35 Minutes (Annex 2)** (together with the associated Annexes 1-18 that are available on the CETAF website) were voted on and approved.

3. Report from the Chair and Executive Committee (May – October 2014), presented by M. Price (Geneva), following the document uploaded on the website in Meeting Package 1 (MP1) on the 25th August 2014. This report details the activities of the Chair and EC during the five month reporting period after CETAF 35. The Chair indicated that the adoption of the CETAF website as an essential tool for internal communication and exchange of information is important for the consortium. To improve efficiency in CETAF meeting functioning and decision taking all necessary documents will be made available, via the website, prior to each general meeting. One of the aims of the EC over the previous year has been to bring the internal functioning of CETAF into line with its statutes and to streamline processes and procedures within the CETAF administrative structure. The Chair indicated that, according to recommendations from the General Meeting in Oslo, she has approached two organisations the BGCI (<http://www.bgci.org/>) and BioSyst (<http://www.biosyst.eu/>) to find out about the possibilities of creating stronger links between these two organisations and CETAF in the future. The Chair requested recommendations from the floor on the main organizations to be contacted by CETAF to strengthen the external relationships of the Consortium. The Chair has submitted an article on CETAF to TAXON (publication of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy). The Chair informed the meeting that CETAF's archives have been transferred to Brussels, thus facilitating the reconstruction of the history of CETAF and the uploading of CETAF core documents to the CETAF website. The **Report from the Chair and EC (Annex 3)** was voted on and approved.

4. Financial reports, presented by A. Casino (GS) & E. Vitek (Treasurer), following documents in MP1. The presentation of the 1st Semester 2014 Financial Report was based on the document included in MP1, uploaded to the website and projected during the meeting. Ana Casino explained the major items and pointed out that the amount of € 30,000 has been allocated as reserves for meeting any legal requirements in case of the dissolution of CETAF. An additional deposit of € 80,000 has been placed in a higher interest rate account. As per September 2014, only 11 membership fees were still pending for payment. The closing of the Accounts for 2014 are expected to adjust fully to the approved budget. The **CETAF 1st Semester 2014 Financial Report (Annex 4.a)** was voted on and approved.

The Budget 2015 was also presented by the GS who went through the main budget items, and explained the differences between it and the previous Budget 2014, which mainly referred to the lower amount devoted to office infrastructure, and the lower expenses related to meetings of the EC and costs for the website, while maintaining the incomes derived from current membership payments. For any new member admitted during 2015, the corresponding fee will be considered as an extra income.

Following a question by C. Pisani (RBINS Brussels) on the Budget for 2015, asking whether the difference in the balance between the current income and current expenses was specific to this year (2014), or whether the same could be foreseen for 2015, E. Vitek (Vienna) clarified that in 2014 the surplus was used for non-recurring expenses, but that in 2015 a balanced budget could be expected. The **CETAF Budget for 2015 (Annex 4.b)** was voted on and approved.

5. Report of the General Secretariat (May 2014-October 2014), presented by A. Casino (GS), following the document in MP1. The main actions undertaken internally (financial issues, personnel, legal obligations, archives, website and community space) and externally (outreach towards third parties, collaborators, partners, advisors and interested bodies and prospective CETAF members) were outlined. Special efforts have been made to raise the profile of CETAF, to connect with the European Commission and to integrate CETAF into European projects and initiatives. Proof of that are the two projects that were submitted on the 2nd September 2014, in which the CETAF AISBL would participate as a direct partner, leading the Work Packages on networking, outreach and dissemination. Those two projects are ELODINS (European Linked Open Data Infrastructure for Natural Sciences, under Call EINFRA-1-2014) and DEDDI (Digitized Distributed Infrastructure, under Call INFRADEV-1-2014) and represent a big step to increase visibility and further the active participation of CETAF, via the GS, in projects of interest to CETAF members.

L. Schulman (Helsinki) congratulated the GS for the new website, although he regretted that it was launched before all information on members was available. He also indicated that information that was submitted by some members before the deadline was still not available. The GS indicated that the decision to publish the information of only a subset of members had been taken by the EC in an effort to encourage all members to submit their passports. Moreover, the GS pointed out that the General Secretariat was still missing half of the Members' Passports. Of the 28 received, the information on 16 institutions has been uploaded to date. M. Price (Geneva) proposed that a statement could be placed on the website indicating that only a subset of the information from members is currently available. It was agreed to deploy such a statement for clarifying the contents already visible on the website. The **Report of the General Secretariat (May 2014-October 2014) (Annex 5.a)** was voted on and approved.

The report was followed by a presentation by B. Herrero (International Relations Officer) of the **Guidelines for the use of CETAF website by Team Leaders**, its privileges, options and actions (**Annex 5.b**). The Guidelines will be made available on the website in the appropriate place.

W. Berendsohn (Dahlem-Berlin) pointed out the importance of capturing data specific to the various levels of use of the different sections of the website. It was also suggested that information on the CETAF Bodies (description of activities, Terms of Reference, etc.) should be made available in the Community section of the website. CETAF Bodies' Coordinators can do this themselves and the General Secretariat can provide help with this issue.

6. Classification of CETAF entities, initiatives and projects created within CETAF, presented by M. Price (Geneva), following the document in MP1. The terms for the entities within CETAF and the classification of CETAF entities, initiatives and projects need to be harmonised or established. The **current classification (Annex 6)** was developed, in accordance with the Statutes and Bylaws, as a reference document; it has also been used for CETAF website structure. The Chair presented the different CETAF Bodies outlining the main differences among them (Working Commissions (WCom), constituted for addressing specific objectives on a short term basis, whereas the Special Interest Groups (SIG) and the Sub-committees (SCom), that focus on topics of core interest to CETAF or specific ongoing issues, are intended to function on a more long term basis). Terms of Reference (ToR) for the working commissions are to be presented to and approved by the General Meeting. The Chair also outlined the classification that had been proposed for the different entities or initiatives that operate under the CETAF umbrella or that are linked to or of interest to CETAF, but that this was open for suggested changes from CETAF members. This document establishes a system for identifying and communicating more clearly on the actions within CETAF and/or within which CETAF participates or that are of interest to CETAF. The General Meeting voted in favour of harmonizing the terminology with the CETAF Statutes and Bylaws and on the principle of the classification. Some members expressed some concerns over the categories or placement of particular items within the classification and they were requested to contact the GS directly with their comments. The final version of the classification will be presented for approval at CETAF 37. Propositions / suggestions for improvements to this document should be sent to the GS.

7. Guidelines for the formation and functioning of CETAF Working Commissions and CETAF guidelines on the use of CETAF funds for the support of CETAF Working Commissions and Special Interest Groups, presented by M. Price (Geneva), following the document in MP1. To ensure that 1) entities that are indicated in the statutes function according to the processes outlined and 2) procedures concerning the use of the CETAF fund that was set aside by the General Meeting for working groups / special interest groups are clear, the abovementioned guidelines were drafted and presented during CETAF 35. Based on the feedback or specific comments received on the preliminary documents during CETAF35 the two drafts were modified. In reference to the formation and functioning of the WCom's, the Chair outlined that they are to produce ToR and a work plan, and be coordinated by a coordinator or co-coordinators (and a deputy coordinator, if considered necessary). The WCom's are to report to the Executive Committee (EC) and to the GM. With respect to the use of funds, the WCom's or SIG's, should send their request for financial support to the Chair and the GS at least one month prior to the need of money, with a brief but clear resume explaining the need and purpose of the requested support (intended to cater for particular needs such as the invitation of experts and guests). If approved by the EC, the funds will be transferred to the beneficiary. The institutions are asked to provide support for travel expenses of their representatives and for any other hosting facilities for meetings as in kind contributions with respect to the activities of the WCom's and SIG's. **Both documents (Annex 7.a and Annex 7.b)** were voted on and approved.

8. CETAF membership application procedure: the CETAF membership application form and CETAF passport, presented by M. Price (Geneva), following the application form and membership application package (<http://www.cetaf.org/members/become-member-cetaf>). The application procedure for CETAF membership, especially the use of more simple application form versus the passport, was in need of clarification. The previous CETAF membership application form has thus been updated and a membership application package (CETAF Statutes and Bylaws, minutes and report from the Chair from the most recent General Meeting) has been created and uploaded to the

CETAF website. The CETAF Passport, with more detailed information, will be requested from new members once their membership has been approved and accepted. Both sets of documents, the **Application package (Annex 8.a)**, and the **Passport package (Annex 8.b)** were voted on and approved.

Before the coffee break, the Chair presented the **CETAF Key Dates (Annex 9)**, that all CETAF members should keep in mind over the next 1.5 years, that include the main issues which will need to be addressed (Secretariat's evaluation, elections, renewal of commitments). The Chair also noted that 2016 will be the 20th Anniversary of CETAF.

9. Establishment of a CETAF Election Commission–Procedure. Nominating Committee (Annex 10), presented by A. Bjørlykke (Oslo). A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) explained that the purpose of the Nominating Committee (NC) would be to propose a balanced composition of the renewed EC, by actively selecting more than one candidate for each position and then choosing the best candidates that would then be presented to GM for approval.

A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) explained that candidates would be nominated from institutions for the selection process that would take place prior to elections. The selection/nominating committee would propose the team for the next Executive Committee as a whole, considering representation in terms of institution size (among big, medium, small institutions), geographic spread, between older and younger members and relevancy to the position, amongst others. The outcome would then be a more independent team though it would imply some effort from the NC's members to identify skilled and qualified people. This Nominating Committee is intended to aid the members and guide the electors, and place a quality control on the new Executive Committee. A number of members agreed with the idea that a nominating committee could provide an alternative approach to the constituting the CETAF EC and be beneficial to the process.

Resulting from the subsequent discussions some members asked for several clarifications (for example, on how candidates were to be chosen, or evaluated, who would be doing the evaluation, and whether the NC would select a number of individuals per position or whether one person could be nominated for any one position).

To clarify the current situation M. Price (Geneva) summarized the current CETAF electoral procedures, as given in CETAF Bylaws that were approved during the CETAF 34 meeting in Edinburgh (Sept. 2013). Currently the CETAF Chair opens the electoral procedure and is responsible for the whole electoral process. Candidates are nominated by CETAF members, after their prior consent and approval from their institutions has been given. These nominations are then sent to the CETAF secretariat. The secretariat compiles the list of nominees for each position and this list is sent to CETAF members 2 months in advance of the elections. At no point is the Chair or the EC implicated in the selection of candidates. The current system is a volunteer-based approach, relying on personal predisposition and the motivation of CETAF members to nominate candidates and on the nominated candidates themselves.

E. Vitek (Vienna) emphasized that there would be a need for clear guidelines for the election process and that this would not be straightforward for a nominating committee. He also added that a nomination committee would only make sense if there are not enough candidates for a given position. Moreover, he pointed out that no one can be forced to stand for nomination, and that therefore there would still be a need to wait for proposals. He understood that the nomination

committee would make a pre-selection of the candidates put-forward, an option to which he personally did not agree with. L. Bartolozzi (Florence) asked for a clarification on whether the selection committee would select a full group of people for the whole EC, presented as a bloc for the elections, or whether they would propose several candidates for each position, as this was not entirely clear from the presentation. He also argued that for CETAF it would be better to have highly motivated people that want to be part of the EC, rather than having a "long CV" that was judged appropriate by the NC.

A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) confirmed that the NC could select individuals for each of the positions, and it would be possible for them to nominate more than one candidate for every position. Member institutions could also nominate candidates from the floor. Such a Nomination Committee would ensure that more candidates would be contending for every position.

N. MacLeod (London) asked for an identification of the problems with the current system. A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) replied that the new system intends to select the best candidates, including the provision of the supporting information on the candidates. This would enable the GM to make better, more informed decisions than the system currently in place. A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) added that the Nominating Committee would look into the candidate's institution to confirm the adequacy and availability of that person.

G. Haszprunar (Munich), though not against the proposal, believed that the preselection of candidates may become potentially problematic and may end up becoming a circular process. To compile the list, the GS should wait for proposals from members and if there were not enough candidates, the EC (or the Nominating Committee, in such a case) should then look for more proposals for the GM to consider. Other members (including C. Pisani (Brussels), and L. Bartolozzi (Florence)) thought that the process would be more closed than the existing one, which they considered to be sufficiently transparent. They insisted on the fact that no committee should have the election rights that are placed upon and shall remain with the GM, and that open voting by the GM is the best democratic guarantee of the whole process. L. Schulman (Helsinki) pointed out that such a Committee would certainly play a role in ensuring the quality of the candidates put forward and that the current proposal of the NC might be modified to support the process in case that no candidates were generated naturally for all the positions.

Various members (L. Bartolozzi (Florence), C. Häuser (Berlin), P.-A. Loizeau (Geneva)) pointed out various problems with accepting nominations from the floor if there is a nomination committee. C. Häuser (Berlin) requested further clarifications because if there is the possibility of free nominations from institutions on the day of the elections then the role of the NC is not clear. P.-A. Loizeau (Geneva) pointed out that nominations from the floor should not be accepted on the day of the elections under any model. There is a need to review the profiles of all candidates prior to the election itself and accepting votes from the floor undermines the integrity of the election process. Moreover, several members indicated their concern that this may lead to the over complication of the process for an organisation that is not that big. A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) indicated that the Nominating Committee would play an active role in searching for qualified candidates and preselecting them, and thus, supporting the proposed final candidacy as being the best choice possible. C. Pisani (Brussels) added that the NC could address two main issues: a) when there were enough good candidates for all the positions; b) to give recommendations that lead to an informed choice of candidates as, as long as due procedure is followed, it is positive to have an evaluation of candidates

beforehand. The meeting decided to remove the acceptance of votes from the floor from the current Bylaws.

N. MacLeod (London) remarked that we have been given a solution while we are still searching for the problem. While the process should be the other way around: If there is a problem it should be discussed and solutions identified.

A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) expressed his frustration over the positions expressed by the members of the EC who were opposing the proposal as he had understood that the NC had had the support of the EC. E. Vitek (Vienna), C. Häuser (Berlin) and T. Bourgoïn (Paris) pointed out that they had not been favourable to a NC. The Chair clarified that this was seen as being a proposal from a CETAF member, and not from the CETAF EC, as a whole.

Given the lack of consensus and the contention expressed over this issue the Chair requested that any further debate on this topic be conducted the following day, when the proposed amendments to the Bylaws would be presented. This decision was approved.

10. CETAF EC interim evaluation of the General Secretariat work plan, and Secretariat three-year work plan: strategic planning and the allocation of resources, presented by M. Price (Geneva). Point 10 (**Presentation by the Chair. Annex 11.a**), and Point 11 of the Agenda (**Proposal for CETAF GS's Work Plan- Annex 11.b**), were presented jointly by the Chair.

M. Price (Geneva) indicated that the General Secretary was hired in October of 2012 and that the Secretariat became fully operational in January of 2013, and that since then a lot of positive changes for CETAF have occurred in its administration, internal functioning, communications and outreach. The Secretariat has focused on the principal objectives in the work plan that include the establishment and operation of administrative structures, the development of new projects and activities, communication and outreach, and liaison activities with third parties. With the achievements of the GS so far in mind, the Chair presented the outlook for the Secretariat in the future: the next three-year work plan for the General Secretariat. The new work plan will benefit from the fact that the CETAF strategy is being outlined as it can be brought into line with CETAF's strategic development over the next 3-year period.

W. Berendsohn (Dahlem-Berlin) commented that the strategy should be the basis of the secretariat's work plan, so that the goals and priorities are translated into actions for the GS. L. Schulman (Helsinki) remarked that the due process should include the definition of the strategy, identification of the development plan that would enable to fulfil it, and the action plan that should implement those two. The Strategy and the Work Plan are to be produced jointly, the latter being embedded in the former, thus ensuring that the plan (in a sense, the GS work plan) fulfils the goals fixed in the strategy. W. Berendsohn (Dahlem-Berlin) pointed out that priorities and goals for the strategy should be discussed at the GM. In this respect, the Chair indicated that the work of the CETAF strategy group would be presented during the meeting and encouraged the CETAF members to participate actively with comments during the meeting and by their participation in the Strategy group, preferably at Directors level.

The Chair concluded that there is now a need to review the old work plan, and integrate CETAF's strategy into the new three year work plan, so that the latter is focused more directly on CETAF

goals and objectives. The upcoming review of the GS might give further input in defining the work plan.

The document presented was the Chair's proposal for the development of the work plan that will be discussed and drafted by the EC. It was agreed that, in order to enhance and refine it, along with the Strategy that will be defined by the Strategy group, the redrafted work plan will be the subject of discussion at CETAF37 in Meise, for its eventual approval in CETAF38.

11. Establishment of a CETAF Secretariat evaluation panel – procedure, presented by M. Price (Geneva). The GS started operating on 2nd October 2012, and, according to the original Work Plan, should be reviewed in October 2015. Such a review, as previously outlined, should be carried by the EC, GM and Secretariat. The GM should discuss this issue and decide who should undertake the review. The EC has drafted a preliminary suggestion on how this procedure could be implicated via the creation of an **Evaluation Panel (Annex 12)**. The proposal is that members of the Evaluation Panel will come from the CETAF membership (up to 4 persons), preferably, at Directors level, that 2 EC members will form a secretariat for evaluation panel, that the GS will be available to facilitate the Evaluation Panel in organisational matters and to respond to requests for information. It was proposed that an external person to CETAF could be nominated. The Chair indicated that there needed to be a two-fold vote on this subject during the meeting: 1) on the procedure (establishment of an Evaluation Panel) and 2) the official nomination of the panel members.

L. Schulman (Helsinki) asked for a more clear identification of where potential external members, may come from. The Chair indicated that such persons could come from the larger CETAF-linked community, such as from LifeWatch.

M. Guiraud (Paris) pointed out that the Evaluation panel resembled an evaluation panel of the EC. To which C. Häuser (Berlin) replied that this review would aim to analyse the working processes and relative success of the Secretariat thus evaluating the 'new CETAF' as is since the GS opened, and the way the organisation is currently working via the Secretariat. The aim of this evaluation panel is to check how this organisation works with a Secretariat and not on the performance of an individual person. It is expected that the evaluation would contribute to the new work plan as well as to the business model that both need to be implemented.

A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) indicated that there was a need for a clear distinction between the EC and the Panel, to place some distance between the two bodies thus ensuring a better analysis. C. Quaisser (Berlin) pointed out that the work plan was created by the General Meeting and thus the evaluation would be better carried out by the GM. This could be done online, via a questionnaire; the results could be tabled to the GM for its consideration. N. MacLeod (London) clarified that the evaluation panel would be only doing the "leg-work", but that their report would of course be reviewed by the General Meeting. E. Smets (Leiden) suggested that number of members in the evaluation panel should be no more than a maximum of 5 to ensure the efficient functioning of the panel, the with 2 EC members giving support. L. Schulman (Helsinki) agreed with that proposal.

The Chair asked for volunteers (4 people raised their hands). It was decided by the meeting to elect the panel officially the following day of the meeting.

12. CETAF EC work plan and CETAF activities October 2014 – October 2015, presented by M. Price (Geneva). The **EC work plan (Annex 13.a)** and the **CETAF activities (Annex 13.b)**, were presented at

CETAF34 in draft form to outline the key activities that would be undertaken by the EC and those that could be undertaken by CETAF over the next year. Since the EC, the administrative body of CETAF, executes the GM's mandate the Chair considered that it is important that the GM is presented with the proposed activities of the EC (as outlined in the statutes).

W. Berendsohn (Dahlem-Berlin) asked why there is a need to propose such a work plan. The Chair answered that the proposed plan brought CETAF EC functioning into line with the requirements outlined in the statutes. Currently the EC undertakes a set of activities in the trust that they will do their best, but that it might be good to give some indications to members on what these activities actually were beforehand (at the moment the Chair and EC report on their activities, retrospectively, on an annual basis – there is no indication of what they intend to do during the course of the following year). W. Berendsohn (Dahlem Berlin) indicated that if the EC already acts on behalf of the GM then that already have the mandate to do so, without the need for any planning. The Chair replied more transparency may go some way to obtaining a higher level of satisfaction from CETAF members but that it is up to the GM to decide if there is interest in this issue and the possibility of providing more structured guidance to the EC on major topics

L. Schulman (Helsinki) pointed out that CETAF should remain as non-bureaucratic as possible, and that it appeared that CETAF was just devoted to making and reviewing plans, instead of doing things. Everything should be simpler and move towards taking action. S. Dessein (Meise) considered having agreed procedures, rules and guidance was constructive, as to know what is expected and what has been achieved with respect to EC activities is a positive thing.

M. Price (Geneva) concluded the discussions by indicating that the EC would present its yearly work plan to the GM for the upcoming year to see whether the process was a useful addition to CETAF functioning. The GM voted, by a majority that, on an annual basis, the EC would present their activities for the next year to the GM.

13. CETAF progress since CETAF 35, presented by M. Price (Geneva), see *Annex 14*.

The Chair acknowledged that the current General Meeting was mainly devoted to housekeeping issues, a very tiring and not very exciting task, but one that is seen as essential for the development of CETAF as it brings CETAF and its functioning in -line with its legal framework. She indicated that CETAF, with its new Secretariat, has evolved and made progress in several different areas over the last year as well as since CETAF 35. These include the launching of the new website, attracting new members, contacts made within the European Commission, outreach within different European sister organisations or entities and the involvement of CETAF, via the Secretariat, in project proposals. The CETAF strategy group is currently working on the strategy and strategic development of CETAF. CETAF, via the Chair and GS, has made contact with different European and international organisations to make preliminary contact or develop closer partnerships (BioSyst, BGCI, SciCOLL, GBIF, LifeWatch, ECSITE, ECSA amongst others). The Chair encouraged the CETAF membership to become more active in CETAF processes, CETAF bodies and initiatives and in creating the CETAF community and identity by contributing to the CETAF website.

Day 2: Wednesday 15th October - CETAF General Meeting

14. Amendments to the CETAF Bylaws, including voted changes to the election process, presented by M. Price (Geneva), see (*Annex 15*). The amendments to the CETAF Bylaws (MP1) were presented, with additional changes that had been done by the EC during their meeting just before CETAF 36. It

was indicated that this was confusing and the meeting decided that it would prefer to have time to examine the newly proposed changes and that a vote on this issue could not be taken as it stood.

In connection with the **Bylaws amendments** as proposed (**Annex 15**), two outstanding points from Day 1 were submitted to the floor.

1) Nominating Committee: As no clear majority was reached during the discussion of this item the Chair decided to postpone voting on it, if and when a more detailed proposal has been tabled that addresses the concerns raised. The meeting agreed that the EC would make one final review of the Bylaws and that these would be circulated to membership for comments in the interim period. After the period for comments is over the amended and updated will be submitted for an inter-sessional vote.

2) Evaluation Panel: The Evaluation Panel was formed by E. Smets (Leiden), L. Bartolozzi (Florence), M. Guiraud (Paris), U. Jöger (NORE Consortium) and M. Garcia-Paris (Madrid). C. Quaisser (Berlin) proposed Wouter Los as a possible external member and H. Enghoff (Copenhagen) considered this to be a very sound proposal. C. Häuser (Berlin) considered that an exterior view could be beneficial to the process, although the person should be close enough to CETA to understand its nature. On the contrary, L. Bartolozzi (Florence) considered that external members were not necessary for the Evaluation Panel and C. Pisani (Brussels) suggested that this decision could be left to the panel members themselves.

The General Meeting approved and voted on the proposed Evaluation Panel and approved, by a majority, that the decision on any external participation, if deemed necessary, should be left to the Evaluation Panel members.

15. Resume reports from CETAF Working Commissions and Special Interest Groups

As part of the new meeting structure the Chair indicated that the CETAF bodies that report to the General Meeting have been requested to provide a written report in parallel with a more brief presentation of the pertinent activities or outcomes of the group that is given during the meeting. The written reports and any other supporting material may be included as part of the meeting package that is circulated to members prior to a meeting.

15.1. The Legislation and Regulations Liaison Group, presented by A. Casino (GS), see **Annex 16.1**.

This group has been actively working on the CETAF Best Practice on ABS. The group met physically in June and has exchanged information via email, on a regular basis. Some members took part in the SPNHC meeting in Cardiff and some were to participate in the side event of the MOP1 to NP in Korea, that was held in parallel to CETAF36 meeting. A comment was raised mentioning the need for legal advice in case of complex legislative issues. The Chair mentioned the existence of small amount of money that has been set aside within the CETAF budget for "legal issues", that could be used for this purpose, if necessary. Contact: cetaf_abs_core@cetaf.org.

15.2 European Initiatives Advisory Group, presented by P. Mergen (Tervuren), see **Annex 16.2**. This

group is intended to create an efficient way build up collaborations among members, to inform members of funding opportunities and to develop adequate strategies for drafting joint proposals, and to raise questions of common concern on funding issues. The group, who has some new members, is currently drafting its ToR in accordance with the Working Commission guidelines. P. Mergen (Tervuren) asked for inputs from CETAF members on their expectations were on what sort of information or service this group could provide. Contact: cetaf_eiag@cetaf.org.

15.3 Collections Policy Board (CPB), presented by C. Quaisser (Berlin), see **Annex 16.3**. This group is currently composed of 25 members with an active core group. The group meets annually (after the Autumn CETAF meeting) to discuss common issues and outline the issues that the group will work on. The group acts as a hub for discussion (collection managements strategies, digitization experiences, collections assessment etc) and has created an European portal for the exchange information among its members. The group identifies common approaches, shares good practices, or initiates new projects, such as EuColCOMP. The future of CPB is pending on decisions to be taken during its next Meeting (on the 16th October, right after the GM). A number of the current core group have or will retire (M. Luz Peñacoba – Madrid, Rob Huxely – London) and new active members who can take on some of the responsibility for the running of the group are needed and C. Quaisser (Berlin) encouraged members to join the group, or to contact people in their institutions who may be interested in joining this group. Contact: cetaf_cpb@cetaf.org.

15.4 Digitization Group, presented by D. Harris (Edinburgh), see **Annex 16.4**. The group is currently formed by 18 members who have skills in collections management, digitization issues and technical experience. The ToR, approved in Oslo, state that one of the main goals is to increase the flow of information on digitization topics in a very fast moving field. The 1st meeting (on the 14th October, right before the GM) was devoted to draft the work plan for a one year term, aiming to achieve: 1. Good cooperation and overlap with other groups; 2. Compliance with the responsibilities on reporting to CETAF; 3. Consideration of all topics related to curation of digital collections (done by means of projects over the last 10 years and those that currently give backing to retrieving objects, annotations etc.). The co-coordinator of the group (E. Haston, Edinburgh) has produced a wiki that presents the resources / data that has collated so far. D. Harris (Edinburgh) encouraged members to join the group (by sending an email to DH/GS). L. Schulman (Helsinki) underlined the fact that curation of the increasing amounts of digital collections is becoming increasingly important. Contact: cetaf_digitization@cetaf.org.

15.5. News from BHL-Europe, presented by J. Frank (Prague), see **Annex 16.5**. J. Frank (Prague) presented the latest activities on BHL, including the migration to the new servers, the content harmonization (a time consuming process), the submission of projects, the internal communication flows (weekly skype meetings) and the interaction of BHL with global nodes, and the dissemination of the BHL libraries. Under the BHL strategy it is considered crucial to have one access point to the central portal (where more than 44000 items are allocated). Future steps are focused on helping new partners create metadata and to ensuring the long term maintenance of repositories of big data (with 3 mirrors backups).

15.6. CETAF e-learning and training Group, presented by I. van der Velde (Brussels) & C. Voreadou (Crete), see **Annex 16.6.a**. This group was proposed and constituted during CETAF35 in Oslo and currently consists of 13 members. The ToR and the Work Plan have been discussed among the members and were presented for the approval of the GM. The main aim of the group is to exchange experiences, best practices, to promote teaching and to develop joint training actions. The Kick-Off meeting took place via Skype on the 27th August where tasks were distributed among the members. At present, the Leonardo da Vinci trainee (Alfonso Escribano), located at the GS, is engaged in finding out the state of the art of e-learning in the fields related to CETAF activity. A questionnaire will be forwarded to members to gather information on their experience with e-learning courses. The Hungarian representative (G. Babocsay) is in touch with the Dean of the University of Budapest in order to introduce a potential CETAF e-learning course into their curriculum. C. Voreadou (Crete)

mentioned that the main characteristics for such a course to be successful are that it is functional, low cost, easily implemented, with a pedagogical perspective and that it takes into account CETAF's unique structure. It was mentioned that this type of course will not replace the face-to-face or field teaching, but complement them. The group intends to submit a proposal under ERASMUS+, at the end of January 2015, for which the group will look for partners. P. Mergen (Tervuren) mentioned that there could be a niche to include CETAF courses in other proposals to ensure funding, by integrating this type of actions in working packages of new proposals. Contact: cetaf_elearning@cetaf.org.

The GM voted and approved both, the **ToR (Annex 16.6.b)** and the **Work Plan (Annex 16.6.c)**.

15.7. CETAF Research Assessment Group, presented by M. Price (Geneva), see **Annex 16.7**. The kick-off meeting of this group took place in Geneva on the 9th June 2014. The group determined that its actions could not change the impact factor in publishing but that the group could try to explore ways to improve the situation for taxonomists by adapting the system. Two focus areas were outlined during the meeting (see Annex 16.7): taxonomic publishing and the assessment of research and researchers in taxonomy. The group intends to produce a specific category of taxonomy based journals that could be submitted to the JCR of the ISIS Web of Science and began work evaluating the categories and indexed journals. The group also worked on refining or developing criteria for the evaluations of taxonomists and taxonomic research (based on one of the outcomes from EDIT project) and refine it. K. Marhold (Bratislava) indicated that the IAPT have been working along similar lines with the aim of creating a category specific to plant taxonomy. L. Schulman (Helsinki) remarked that instead of categorizing through IF, the Journals could be classified into 3 categories: high, medium and low impact (as done in the Finnish Publication Evaluation system where Journals and platforms are evaluated) and that this could be an avenue to be explored. E. Smets (Leiden) pointed out the difficulty for systematists to publish in the top 10% of journals in any of the categories relevant to CETAF. B. Georgiev (Sofia) recommended the CETAF could get together with SCOPUS when approaching WoS. Contact: cetaf_research@cetaf.org.

15.8. CETAF Strategy Group, presented by M. Price (Geneva), see **Annex 16.8**. The group has held two meetings, both in Geneva, to work on developing the CETAF strategy using the CETAF SWOT analysis and CETAF round table discussion as a foundation and input from the core members of the group. Five strategic areas for CETAF were identified and these were divided into 25 components (units), each with the corresponding objective(s), actions and actors identified. This draft strategy document will be presented under a later agenda item. The need for more members from CETAF to become involved in the group was stressed, especially from the Director and/or Senior management level. Contact: cetaf_strategy@cetaf.org, and/or michelle.price@ville-ge.ch.

16. Resume of the CETAF Earth Sciences workshop, presented by A. Bjørlykke (Oslo). The CETAF Earth Sciences Workshop was held on the 13th October on Earth Sciences with 25 attendants. A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) pointed out that CETAF should be understood as a network of facilities rather than just a group of taxonomy related institutions. Thus, Earth Science collections (an important part of many of the CETAF institutions), their related research and other activities (such as exhibitions) should have their own representation within CETAF. The museums / institutions should work with all their components combined (exhibitions, research and collections). From this perspective it was considered to be very important to present the existing Earth sciences collections (minerals, fossils...) within CETAF. During the workshop the fact that Earth Science strategy should be embedded into the CETAF strategy was discussed. The workshop created a CETAF Earth Science group, with J. Eder

(Stuttgart) acting as the initial coordinator. For the moment the group will communicate via email and will meet to discuss the ToR and consolidate inputs to the general CETAF strategy.

G. Haszprunar (Munich) stressed that for most members there was no doubt that Earth Sciences were integrated into CETAF and that they recognized that this field had an important influence on taxonomic work.

The formation of the CETAF Earth Science group was unanimously approved by the GM.

17. The proposed CETAF strategy and strategic development plan – draft. This item was postponed for later discussion (after the speaker in the afternoon session) and the proposed change in the agenda was accepted by the GM.

18. Reports on current CETAF activities, initiatives and projects, and updates on other matters that are relevant to CETAF members

18.1. CETAF ISTC Initiative on Stable Identifiers for specimens, presented by A. Güntsch (Dahlem-Berlin), see **Annex 17**. The **CETAF ISTC poster on Stable Identifiers**, that summarizes the implementation of this technique for biological specimens, was the main outcome of the groups recent activities. The design and presentation of the poster was developed by the GS. There is a complementary site for the technical materials, and the possibility to ask directly to any of the coordinators of this action (A. Güntsch-Dahlem Berlin; G. Hagedorn-Berlin; R.Hyam-Edinburgh and D. Röpert-Dahlem Berlin), for assistance in the implementation of Stable Identifiers in collections. It was pointed out their high impact on collection management. A. Güntsch (Dahlem-Berlin) took this opportunity to announce that the next ISTC meeting will be held at Digitalium (Finland) on the 17th March 2015, followed by the EU BON workshop.

Other initiatives, including the GGBiodiversity (from Global Genome Biodiversity Network-GGBN), might be linked to CETAF Stable Identifiers, because most of them are based on the same specimen IDs. It was clarified that the data provider fixes the path (as owner of the corresponding Data Bases). T. Bourgoin (Paris) outlined that this product is a real concrete result of CETAF (not the first, as remarked by the Chair and Camille Pisani, since some others were already on place: ABS Code of Conduct and EJT, respectively) but still a very interesting line to continue. The group what thanked for its work.

A printed copy (in A4 format) of the Poster was distributed and further copies are available: (http://www.cetaf.org/sites/default/files/cetaf-istc_stable_identifiers_poster50x70.pdf).

The CETAF ISTC poster on Stable Identifiers was voted and approved.

18.2. European Journal of Taxonomy (EJT), presented by L. Bénichou (Paris) & K. Martens (Brussels). Following his presentation (**Annex 18.a**) K. Martens (Brussels) indicated that EJT was a Diamond open access journal (neither the authors nor the readers pay) as the 6 organizations (the current EJT consortium members) collectively share and/or pay for the costs. The next volume of the EJT will be its 100th issue, and the EJT will make a printed version of this issue for distribution. K. Martens (Brussels) also pointed out that to become a member of EJT it is not necessary for an institution to give up its own in-house journal. K. Martens (Brussels) referred to the improved website and

mentioned EJT's rigid publishing schedule to comply with the regularity criteria as it is currently being evaluated by ISIS WoS (Thomson Reuters) to obtain an Impact Factor (IF).

Recognition of the EJT as CETAF's official journal

H. Enghoff (Copenhagen), Chair of the EJT Steering Committee, took the floor and presented the proposal (**Annex 18.b**) by EJT to become an associated journal of CETAF. In order to strengthen the ties with CETAF, EJT would like to formalize its recognition as an associated journal of CETAF (CETAF Associated Journal). The EJT, with its focus on taxonomy, is central to the activities of CETAF members. It promotes taxonomy, all the current consortium members belong to CETAF and the initiative itself was created under the CETAF initiated EDIT project. K. Martens (Brussels) pointed out the advantages of the EJT for CETAF as it opens the possibility to publish position papers and statements or declarations from CETAF.

G. Haszprunar (Munich) considered that proposal was an excellent way of giving coverage and outreach to the publication of CETAF decisions and opinions, that would be then cited and could reach a broader public. There would be no additional cost for that. N. Macleod (London) made the point that making EJT 'an' or 'the' associated journal makes a big difference and that using 'an' may be more appropriate. A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) indicated that this that definition would mean that the scope covers most but not everything since some activities and fields could not be published through the EJT. W. Berendsohn (Dahlem-Berlin) commented that this proposition was acceptable in principle, though there were some concerns as there is not currently much coverage in botany. K. Martens (Brussels) replied that the editors themselves are not responsible for the publications submitted, though the number of botanic papers is increasing. D. Harris (Edinburgh) remarked that this proposal was not known in advance of the meeting and that time is required for analysing it. In the meanwhile, the benefits for CETAF should be clearly expressed. P.-A. Loizeau (Geneva) commented that completely Open access journals dealing with taxonomy are uncommon and he supports the idea. E. Smets (Leiden) indicated that for some institutions it might be preferential to have some more time to consider the proposal. C. Häuser (Berlin) pointed out that the EC did not reach a consensus on this issue and there has no concrete recommendation on this topic. He questioned the urgency of the issue and indicated that the GM should not necessarily set a precedent that may have future repercussions. C. Pisani (Brussels) replied that there is no urgency to make EJT the official journal. However, this initiative was launched from within CETAF and has proven to be successful in the field of biotaxonomy. All these type of initiatives contribute to CETAF, to the visibility of CETAF and fulfilling the objectives of CETAF. The EJT could be seen as a strategic tool that could make an important contribution to the CETAF community and the taxonomic community at large. What is now being sought now by the EJT is for broader recognition of the importance of EJT within CETAF. Members requested clearer criteria accepting initiatives as "official" or "associated", a task that will be undertaken by the EC. M. Garcia Paris (Madrid) asked for clarification on whether the institutional journals would become official too. E. Vitek (Vienna) pointed out that if an initiative becomes "official" to CETAF, the Consortium undertakes a responsibility (it goes further beyond a mere designation) that could lead to a legal / financial risk. P.-A. Loizeau (Geneva) considered that this was a very slow procedure for decision taking. M. Price (Geneva), acknowledged the frustration felt by some members with respect to voting / decision taking but underlined that much of the related documentation had not been submitted in time for the meeting, highlighting the need that members receive documentation for voting items well in advance of each meeting in order that informed decisions can be taken. The Chair formally requested that all issues that are to be added to the agenda as voting items the related documentation should be sent to the EC at least one month in advance of the meeting.

H. Enghoff (Copenhagen) proposed to take this proposal off the table so the latest draft could be further discussed and resubmitted to CETAF. The Chair indicated that the EC would deal with this issue and either submit the item for a vote intersessionally or during the upcoming meeting in Meise.

The Chair concluded that the EC could evaluate the proposal before it was circulated to members for an intersessional vote or for a vote during the upcoming meeting in Meise.

18.3 BioCASE and OpenUP! look to the future, presented by W. Berendsohn (Berlin-Dahlem), see **Annex 19**. The contributions of CETAF to Europeana, via OpenUP! was highlighted, including the service providing common names for species. OpenUp! is the third largest content provider to Europeana, with images of botanical objects and bird sounds, among others. A proposal has been submitted by BGBM (with other subcontracted companies) to allow the possibility of continuation of OpenUp! as contributor to Europeana (CEF proposal).

18.4. SYNTHESYS III, presented by R. Huxley (London), see **Annex 20**. The first call from SYNTHESYS III (the project started in Sept 2013 and will run until Oct 2017) was very successful. The latest call for TAF visits closes on the 16th October 2014 with a new call to be launched in 2015. R. Huxley (London) also indicated that the Collections self-assessment tool was available to CETAF members via the SYNTHESYS website (<http://www.synthesys.info/network-activities/synthesys3-na2/self-assessment/>).

P Mergen (Tervuren) pointed out that there were two new German members and asked if others could be added to the project. E. Vitek (Vienna) indicated that to become new partner of SYNTHESYS takes long time and a motivated request has to be sent to the project leader; they could only come into the project when the EU Commission accepts them.

19. New Proposals for CETAF

19.1 News from Florence (Italy), presented by L. Bartolozzi (Florence), see **Annex 21**. The damage suffered by the Botanical Garden of the NHM of Florence and the Natural History Museum of Genova, due to the storms that occurred in September and October 2014, was shown. The water level reached 3 m in some areas causing considerable damage in the ground floor of the museum facilities and strong winds caused much damage to the open exhibitions and buildings (gardens, trees, infrastructure) of the Botanical Gardens. Based on these recent events, L. Bartolozzi (Florence), announced that the Director of the Botanical Garden would like to host a conference in one year's time (scheduled for the 19 September 2015 in Florence), on the topic of *Climate Change effects on Botanical Gardens*, under the umbrella of CETAF.

C. Häuser (Berlin) commented that there are already certain protocols and procedures for Emergency Assessment for overcoming these kinds of situations (such as the cleaning of damaged formaldehyde repositories) that were produced as a result of other tragedies (such as that in Innsbruck a couple of decades ago). M. Guiraud (Paris) indicated that there is also a Disaster Plan that was drafted under SYNTHESYS I.

The proposition was accepted by the meeting.

19.2 Scientific Collections International (SciCOLL), presented by SciCOLL Program Manager, E. Graham (Smithsonian Institute-Washington DC,USA), see **Annex 22**. The 'new' SciCOLL was introduced as this organisation was reorganised and reborn in November 2013, with the overarching objective: to engage both, the interested public and scientific communities through 4 main fields of reference (Food security, Emerging Diseases, Environmental change and Human Migration). The organizations involved include Biomedical societies, Earth science societies, and others are invited to join, including CETAF. The SciCOLL register of collections is based on their digitization, thus considers collections as an infrastructure supported online. That is the principle in which the SciCOLL initiative of a global registry is rooted. Following the existing Global Registry of Biorepositories (GRBIO), the GRSciCOLL intends to collate data on all biological collections, for their broad collective use, by providing unique identifiers (institutional codes) to the objects contained therein. SciCOLL participated in the last meeting of the Society for Preservation of Natural History Collections (SPNCH), held in Cardiff (UK) last June, where the different ways of maintaining collections alongside the development of new technologies, were discussed. SciCOLL needs to grow. There are 3 national members: USA, Australia and Belgium; and individual institutions that include: NHM London, MNHN Paris, MfN Berlin, MNCN Madrid, NHM Korea and NHM of Veracruz, Brazil.

A. Güntsch (Dahlem-Berlin) indicated that isolated initiatives often duplicate the actions that are already on-going, often without building up from what already exists and thus they have a detrimental impact on collective work. E. Graham (Washington DC) replied that they SciCOLL is more than willing to interact with different initiatives, such as CETAF, in order to be able to provide support, avoid repetition and to jointly build on topics of common interest as well as to bring in the concept of interdisciplinary collections.

Some other questions were raised as to whether the SciCOLL register will consider an interdisciplinary approach. There was also a concern on the very ambitious aim of the SciCOLL register with the inclusion of all scientific collections. It was noted that Index Herbariorum (that contains information on the world's herbaria) was not incorporated. M. Price (Geneva) indicated that CETAF would remain in contact with SciCOLL, via the secretariat, to work on common issues and to try to avoid repetition. E. Graham was thanked for her contribution to the meeting.

20. CETAF Membership Applications

Bulgaria

Boyko Georgiev, from the Institute of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Research (IBER-BAS) represented the Bulgarian Consortium, formed by the National Museum of Natural of Sofia and the IBER-BAS which belongs to the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. He excused Prof. Nikolai Spassov, from the NMNH Sofia, who was unable to attend the meeting and presented the **joint application (Annex 23)**.

The Chair announced that EC recommendation is that the Bulgarian Application is presented to the floor. Following due procedure, B. Georgiev (Sofia) left the room while the vote was carried out. The GM unanimously approved the Bulgarian Consortium as a new member of CETAF. The Bulgarian Consortium will be contacted to request that each member of the consortium completes a CETAF passport.

A potential new CETAF member from Portugal

The Chair announced the attendance of Paulo Gama Mota, from the Science Museum, University of Coimbra, Portugal, who attended CETAF36as an observer on behalf of the Portugese consortium.

This consortium is currently preparing to submit an application to join CETAF (to be presented hopefully in Spring 2015 in Meise).

21. Upcoming CETAF Meetings

CETAF37 – Meise, Belgium (21st-22nd April 2015)

CETAF38 – Geneva, Switzerland (13th-14th October 2015)

CETAF39 – Budapest, Hungary. Zoltan Korsós, General Director of the Hungarian Natural History Museum in Budapest, offered to host CETAF39, in Spring 2016. Dates to be confirmed.

CETAF40 – Venue and dates to be confirmed.

22. Any Other Business

22.1. Comments on the Nagoya Protocol, presented by C. Häuser (Berlin).

a) *Entering into force of the Nagoya Protocol (NP)*

The Nagoya Protocol and the Regulation on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) entered into force on the 12th October 2014. This Protocol, as ratified by the European Union, and the associated ABS Regulation will apply to all countries in the EU. Some European countries have implemented national laws in accordance with the NP, such as Denmark, Norway, Spain, Hungary and Switzerland, but the remainder do not yet have any legal specific framework at national level.

C Häuser (Berlin) recommended that institutions should be extremely cautious when dealing with specimens that are received into institutions, ensuring that the due diligence requirement on the use of those genetic resources which falls under the NP are applied. He commented that the lack of clarity of the regulation hampers the deployment of any clear procedures (e.g. sharing data of an specimen might be considered as “use”, and thus, falling under ABS).

b) *Court Case submitted by plant breeders in Germany*

C. Häuser (Berlin) indicated that the German Plant Breeders Association has filed an application to annul the ABS regulation in the European court. As soon as it is published in the European Union Official Journal (EU OJ) there will be 6 weeks for anyone to place a new legal recourse, provide support to the court case, or simply join the Application. Several means can be used: A brief (“*Amicus curiae*”) to the Court, provided you are directly affected, or a Direct Intervention. The current Court case is based on 5 main arguments, of which, at least 2 of them, could also be taken up by CETAF: namely legal uncertainty and being counter-productive (with respect to the need to foster cooperation among the countries affected by ABS).

J. Eder (Stuttgart) asked if there is a clear idea amongst CETAF members on what to do at the Institutional level. Some institutions (such as BGBM Dahlem-Berlin) have already prepared an inventory of pre-NP state of their herbaria and other collections. Otherwise there was a general feeling that non-one really knows precisely how the regulations will affect them or what to do at the present time. There was a concern raised on the impact of the Regulation on private collections compiled in the past and acquired after the entry into force of the NP. E. Vitek (Vienna) recommended to be careful when “using” them (analysing DNA or the chemical content of specimens). C. Häuser (Berlin) remarked that if you can prove that those collections were in private hands, in your same country, then there should not be a problem (because there will not be an international exchange of specimens). C. Häuser (Berlin) insisted on the need to be cautious when handling new genetic resources and, generally, to get in contact with the national entities in charge, as they will have to provide resources and advice. G. Haszprunar (Munich) suggested that CETAF could support the court case by providing a support letter. Following this suggestion, it was proposed and accepted, the EC and/or the Legislations group would analyse the possibility that

CETAF produce a statement in support of the Court Case, with any necessary legal support to be covered by CETAF budget, and expressing the CETAF position on the NP and ABS regulation. If produced, it could be published in EJT, as an opinion paper.

22.2. Upcoming Events

P. Mergen (Tervuren) announced that the next TDWG Meeting that will be held on 27-31 October, in Sweden. The main theme of the meeting will refer to standards and applications. P. Mergen (Tervuren) also commented that TDWG will meet next year in Africa.

22.3. The CReATIVE-B Project, presented by J. Konijn (University of Amsterdam), see **Annex 24**. The presence of Research Infrastructures (RI) in on-going or recently finalized projects, such as Creative-B (www.creative-b.eu), was outlined. The aim of the CReATIVE-B project was to define a Roadmap for Research Infrastructures, looking for their interoperability in order to be able to respond to policy questions at 3 levels: Community engagement (Identifying user interactions, and using RI's as brokers (between providers and users); Technology (Fostering the interoperability among the RI's via the identification of certain platforms to the promotion of skills required to manage them (Bioinformatics)); Legal and governance issues: How scientists work (modelling workflows, as from the project named BioVEL, Biodiversity virtual e-Laboratories), and which are the legal impediments that shall be overcome (data licenses). The CReATIVE-B roadmap presents some recommendations, in to be implemented via new projects and with the support of high level experts groups. J. Konijn (Amsterdam) transmitted how Wouter Los envisages CETAF, as one legal entity which coordinates multiple operational sites.

P. Mergen (Tervuren) indicated that there are several other projects that link with cultural infrastructures. J. Konijn (Amsterdam) pointed out that there are still borders and boundaries among different disciplines and fields of research that should be overcome and that by doing so we can strengthen biodiversity and ecosystem scientific pillars. M. Price (Geneva) pointed out that within CETAF the possibility of integrating this into CETAF Strategy should be explored.

A printed copy of the Roadmap (outcome of the CREATIVE-B project) was distributed to CETAF members. J. Konijn (Amsterdam) was thanked for his contribution to the meeting.

23. The CETAF strategy and strategic development plan – draft (before, Point 18), presented by Michelle Price based on documents in MP1, see “Strategy 2015-2024” with its Annexes, **Annex 25**. The first draft of the CETAF strategy and strategic development document, and the Roadmap that guides this process, was presented. The Taxonomy factor and the core themes within CETAF (Collections, Tools, Research and Policies) are the key areas of focus for the CETAF strategy. To move from the strategy itself towards its implementation a summary of the “Critical components for taxonomy and collections across Europe_V1” document was presented, in brief. This document outlines the activity areas and specific tasks that are needed to fulfil the outlined goals, by means of members collaborations and joint efforts. The strategy will be developed by focusing on 5 strategic areas: Collections, Taxonomy, Science, Policy & Promotion, and Education & Outreach, all of which are supported by an overarching area focused on *Internal coherence & Communications*. Each of the Strategic areas will include a set of components which can be divided into specific elements (tasks / actions). The draft of the strategy, as designed by the Strategy group, will be circulated after the CETAF 36 meeting, with a month given for members’ comments and contributions that should be returned by 31st of January. The Strategy group would then elaborate the final proposal that will be presented in Meise (CETAF37).

L. Schulman (Helsinki) considered that an Action plan is an essential part of a Strategy, although the two documents should be considered separately, given that the Strategy should last longer than a work plan (or action plan). E. Smets (Leiden) replied that, along with the strategy for CETAF, concrete actions for implementation were needed thus these were developed at the same time as the strategy and for the same time period. W. Berendsohn (Dahlem-Berlin) preferred to have two documents, with the directions and guidelines of strategic vision that could then be implemented with a 3 year planning for the Secretariat. M. Price (Geneva) indicated that there are two documents, the strategy itself and the associated action plan, although this is currently set for 10 years and directed at the level of CETAF. The secretariat work plan can be developed from within the overall CETAF strategy.

C. Pisani (Brussels) wished to congratulate the group for the work done so far, though she wanted to make some changes and comments in the detailed deployment (some goals are means, some others should be removed or adjusted...). In any case, she wanted to underline some issues: a) CETAF is a body itself and an association of bodies, a network of networks. The Strategy should make explicit reference to the relations of CETAF with its members, through the services provided to them; b) The Strategy does not mention the partnership with other networks in many complementary areas, in Europe and globally (ECSITE, European Schoolnet, Geological Survey...).

M. Giraud (Paris) emphasized the need for the strategy to clarify the role of CETAF for and towards its members. This question should be considered as part of the internal coherence. E. Smets (Leiden) highlighted the importance of the expectations, especially on what members expect from CETAF, in contrast to what the members are ready to give up (at an institutional level) in order that CETAF can do it in their place. A. Bjørlykke (Oslo) highlighted the importance of the individual members taking on responsibility for CETAF and for actions because of the limited capacity of the GS. Some things can be delegated, though others may require additional responsibilities and commitments from members. The whole strategy document must include a larger commitment from each and all members. T. Bourgoïn (Paris) pointed out that the situation is never black or white and that contributions and collaborations are the key for the cohesive and effective functioning of the Consortium.

M. Price (Geneva) indicated that the documents presented represent a preliminary draft that was composed by the active members of the strategy group for discussion and refinement by CETAF members. The strategy documents (strategy and action plan) will be distributed to the general membership after CETAF36 for comment. The CETAF strategy group will meet to work on the new draft in early 2015. MP also encouraged CETAF members to become active in the strategy group.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FORMAL CLOSURE OF CETAF 36 GENERAL MEETING.

The Chair emphasized that CETAF and the CETAF membership is now in the position to collectively work on reshaping and adapting the unique consortium, raising its profile at home and abroad and outlining its future direction. In order that CETAF fulfils its objectives and that CETAF members benefits from the new structure a number of internal processes and procedures needed to be streamlined in order to ease the way forward. Although these may have consumed a large proportion of the time during the CETAF36 meeting they are necessary in order to establish a solid framework for the future. The upcoming meeting can now focus on CETAF strategy as well as the issues linked to the key events that will occur within CETAF over the next year and a half, leading up to the elections of the CETAF Executive Committee that will be held in Spring of 2016. The Chair

highlighted the need to move forward with decision making processes where decisions are actually taken more regularly and quickly either at meetings and/or intersessionally. For this purpose, documents will be made available in advance of a meeting or inter-sessional vote on the website, and timely contributions from Members are expected.

The Chair stressed the need for active contributions from all CETAF members to CETAF core documents, CETAF Bodies and other CETAF entities as well as to the development of the CETAF strategy.

The CETAF 36 General Assembly was officially closed at 15.30 pm.

LIST OF ANNEXES

- Annex 1. Agenda CETAF36
- Annex 2. Minutes of CETAF35 General Meeting
- Annex 3. Report from the Chair and EC
- Annex 4. 4.a. CETAF 1st Semester 2014 Financial Report
4.b. CETAF Budget for 2015
- Annex 5. 5.a. Report of the General Secretariat
5.b. Guidelines for the use of CETAF website by Team Leaders
- Annex 6. Current classification of CETAF entities, initiatives and projects created within CETAF
- Annex 7. 7.a. Guidelines for the formation and functioning of CETAF Working Commissions
7.b. CETAF guidelines on the use of CETAF funds for the support of CETAF Working Commissions and Special Interest Groups
- Annex 8. 8.a. Application package
8.b. Passport package
- Annex 9. CETAF Key Dates
- Annex 10. CETAF Nominating Committee
- Annex 11. 11.a. Presentation by the Chair
11.b. Proposal for CETAF GS's Work Plan
- Annex 12. CETAF Secretariat Evaluation Panel
- Annex 13. 13.a. EC work plan
13.b. CETAF activities
- Annex 14. CETAF progress since CETAF 35
- Annex 15. Bylaws amendments
- Annex 16. 16.1. Legislation and Regulations Liaison Group
16.2. European Initiatives Advisory Group
16.3. Collections Policy Board
16.4. Digitization Group
16.5. News from BHL-Europe
16.6. a. Presentation of CETAF e-learning and training Group
b. Terms of Reference (CETAF e-learning and training Group)
c. Work Plan (CETAF e-learning and training Group)
16.7. CETAF Research Assessment Group
16.8. CETAF Strategy Group
- Annex 17. CETAF ISTC Initiative on Stable Identifiers for specimens

- Annex 18. 18.a. Presentation of European Journal of Taxonomy (EJT)
 - 18.b. Proposal for Recognition of the EJT as CETAF's official journal
- Annex 19. BioCASE and OpenUP! look to the future
- Annex 20. SYNTHESYS III
- Annex 21. News from Florence (Italy)
- Annex 22. Scientific Collections International (SciCOLL)
- Annex 23. The Bulgarian Application
- Annex 24. The CReATIVE-B Project
- Annex 25. CETAF strategy and strategic development plan – draft