Skype Conference "Manual Meeting" - Minutes

Date / Time	22. June 2017, 10:00 -11:50
Participants	Alenka Pirman CCP3 - Anna Szoeke WP5 & CCP4 – Cristina F. Colombp WP6 - Gisela Hagmair WP7 - Klaus Schönberger WP4 & WP7 - Marion Hamm WP4 - Melanie Proksch WP4 - Nora Landkammer WP3 - Roma Sendyka CCP2 - Tal Adler WP1, WP5 & CCP4
Excused	Suzana Milevska WP1, Martin Krenn CCP5
Minute Takers	Melanie Proksch, Marion Hamm (both WP4), plus skype chat.
Proviso	Please check if these minutes represent what was said – otherwise let us know about necessary changes in the comments of the basecamp central message board where these minutes were published.

Item	Notes and Discussion	Results	Action
Vision	 Book speaks to practicioners incl. museums, archives, artists, academics. Practical character in contrast to more academic WP2 publication. Aesthetics are important, visuals, design to highlight structure. Playful and analytical account with a critical discussion of self irony Strategies of handling contentiousness Case studies that highlight day-to-day work Focus on process of coproduction in interaction with contentious heritage. Peer-to-peer conversation rather than "best-practice advice" Transform the order of knowledge PHASES (Alenka) promise/motivation relationships (different structures of CCPs: roles, power, authority) working processes (the pace of things, roles) state of the art / analytical 	 Honest first-hand accounts of process Audience defined Character and accessibility defined Question: Can we imagine a book that we would like to look at for inspiration in our own processes? 	 Leading question: What would be helpful for WPs & CCPs right now? Guiding questions to develop CCP contributions see WP4 basecamp message: <u>https://public.3.bas</u> <u>ecamp.com/p/PYp</u> <u>PwSDnDxuyJwKJ</u> <u>WE1RQL51</u> WP4 to contact each CCP
Conte nts	 Specific stories. Problems and solutions. Focus on initial 2 years. Crucial actions in summer 2018 can be handed in later. Analysis: Comparing modes of dealing with situations in CCPs Working processes Future ideas 	 Book focus on initial 2 years Additional short pieces on final product/ research action 	 Swapping rough materials (ideas, descriptions, visuals) before and after MTM

	 Self-reflexivity: Explore projections and stereotypes within trans-disc teams (TRACES, CCPs, audiences, vis-à-vis contentious heritage) Present CCPs as an innovative and flexible model with different roles & structures (relationships, motivation, roles, power, authority, space, timing) Contentious Heritage as analytical model/ how to make heritage contentious? 		
Title	 Different views on the title 'manual'. As problematic as the term ,Best practice' or ironic reference to top-down rule-books? Can the book keep the promise of being a manual? "best practice = useless". "interesting practice" better? 	 Need to clarify appropriate title expressed Proposals "Manual" and "Working with Contentious Heritage in Practice" Critical position on term "best practice" 	 Focus on contents of the book at present Collect proposals for other titles Define title of the book to match contents Critical reflection on 'best practice'
WP2 Book	 Need to emphasise differences between WP2 and WP4 publications to avoid replications. different settings and audiences. 	WP2 more academic. WP4 speaks to practicioners. Theoretical parts to be linked to practice	 Ask Arnd if internal TRACES publication of ethnographers reports possible
Time Sche dule	 (In-)Ability of evaluating covering the entire process of the CCPs in the book. How to include research and actions occuring after April 2018? All costs need to be paid by end of Feb 2019, including publishing. The deadline for delivering the manual can be extended. Proofreader, graphic designer and publisher need time for their work. Call to "be cautious and observe ourselves" 	 Moved hard deadline for delivery of complete manuscript to publisher from November 18 to January 19, to include some contributions on research/actions during summer 18. Proposal: Deadline 1 April 18, deadline 2 autumn 18. Fine-tune suitable deadline for each contribution within this frame. WP3 agrees to deliver field material until April 18. Also extended abstract on analysis? 	 Revise time schedule (WP4) Editing process starts in April with contributions about first 2 TRACES years, and rough material April 2018: hand in extended abstract and no of words on Summer 2018 actions. Graphic designer will work with blank pages for these contributions Each contributor/group to be asked for suitable deadline for each contribution

Proce ss	 ToDo List including everything required, for WP2, WP4, the MTM etc. It would be helpful for WP4/board to have a list of each planned CCP action and deliverable. Avoid copy-paste reflex Useful to find synergies and avoid overlaps 	Identified need of CCPs for concise, timed To-Do list of expected contributions for MTM and each publication. Identified need for list of each CCP planned action/ deliverable/ event report	 Make list of manual content items and timing for every CCP. Including materials for MTM-WP4 workshop (WP4) Decide who will collect CCP ToDos from all other WPs Make list of each CCP planned action/deliverable (Who?)
Ackno wledg ement s	 All authors and creators will be acknowledged If several people were involved in an item, they will be credited for their work Board will be credited for book concept 		 See Gisi's document on ,Contributing' <u>https://public.3.bas</u> ecamp.com/p/G1y <u>KQ4X3kAR918DK9</u> euepaQh
Role of Board	 Need to formalize the board was expressed Do we need to separate editorial board and concept group? Several but not too many board meetings. Invite additional people as required. The more people are involved in the process, the higher the motivation to deliver stuff. But: smaller groups work more intensively Concerns about decision making: content decision by board binding for editors? WP4 is part of board and its content discussions. Board decisions will take operational needs into consideration. The minutewriter we can continue the format of open editorial sessions, in addition to the board – the minutewriter 	 Need to define role of board (editorial board? Concept group? Only one group?) Alenka, Nora and Roma stated in writing they want to be on board. Option to join later in the process in agreement with existing board members Identified need to define: board for consultation or decision? 	 Check with excused and participants of today's meeting: who wants to be on the board (WP4) Discuss proposals for board role: Developing and tweaking book concept, collective decision making Board supports WP4 in arranging, collating and publishing Traces contributions Polimi: advice on possible publishers
Role of WP4 (Man ual is WP4 delive rable)	 Editorial work: Collecting contributions Editing and proof reading Ensure publication happens within EU deadlines Process and finalise book concept developed in collaboration with board Find publisher in collaboration with board Administration Facilitate communication amongst contributors and board Time keeping 	 WP4 role defined: responsible for operational decisions 	 Publish doodle for a board meeting in September pre- MTM before end of July (WP4) Fix appropriate date for editorial workshop (WP4)

	 Organizing editorial workshop with board and guests if necessary As things stand, nobody a part from WP4 has come forward to take on editorial work. 		
Conc erns	superficial" I tend to decline" – no deep analysis possible before conclusion of project.	Identified conflict on our desires on book content and H2020 commitments	 Reflect on how to make this impossibility productive (hehe, the minute writer)

Glad you have found the time to take part today - looking forward to hearing from you! Marion & Melanie