

## **Minutes of the Fifth Management Committee Meeting, COST action A35: Progressore, Paris, March 28th 2009**

### **Present:**

*Members of the committee:* Gerard Beaur (GB), Rosa Congost (RC), Bas van Bavel (BvB), Anne-Lise Head-König (ALHK), Richard Hoyle (RH), Erich Landsteiner (Els), Ernst Langthaler (Elt), Aud Tretvik (AT), Mats Morell (MM), Peter Moser (PM), Geir Orderud (GO), Matti Peltonen (MP), Socrates Petzemas (SP), Vicente Pinilla (VP), Bjørn Poulsen (BP), Peter Pozsgai (PP), Carsten Porskrog Rasmussen (CPR), Rui Santos (RS), Philipp Schofield (PRS), Jose Vicente Serrao (JVS), Patrick Svesson (PSv), Bas van Bavel (BvB), Nadine Vivier (NV).

*Experts:* Paul Brassley (PB), Anton Schurmann (AS), Enrique Tello Aragay (ETA)

*From COST:* Julia Stamm (JS), Daniela Koleva (DK)

### **1. Adoption of Agenda**

The agenda was adopted as proposed by GB

### **2. Minutes of last meeting**

AT asked to the point of “Network of Networks”. GB replied, that Annie Antoine and Erik Thoen had represented our action in meetings, but had no specific news beyond that.

The minutes were accepted without further comments

### **3. Action budget planning**

GB presented the status. For the final budget year 2008-2009 ending at may 31<sup>st</sup> a total of 120.000 euro were allocated. Of these 71.000 are spent. To this comes 50.000 euro for the final conference. Most of the remaining ca. 49.000 is planned to be used for the publications, but it is difficult to have very many books published before that. To this JS replied that it was not decisive that books were fully completed by that, if only they were so far that the publisher could send the final invoice. GB would try to have this done for as many books as possible and try to find additional funds for the rest.

GB further informed that of the three STMS-scholars approved at the fourth meeting of the MC, one is at present in Paris and one in Gerona, whereas the third has been cancelled.

The budget was approved

### **4. Publications, annual report**

GB presented the status of publication of the twelve volumes.

- Of the four volumes emerging from the workshops of 2006 the first (volume 4) is printed and was presented. Volume 2 is ready to go in printing, whereas the editing of volumes 1 and 3 is nearly completed and expected to be finished within few weeks.
- Of the four volumes emerging from the 2007 workshops the editing of the one based upon the Lisbon workshop is expected to be nearly finished in may, while the one based upon the Rennes workshop is expected to be finished from the editor in september. The status of the two others (Torunn and Münster workshops) is more uncertain and here much work remains to be done.

- Of the volumes emerging from the 2008 two volumes (workshops in Lund and Sarospatak) are expected to be finished by the editors by september, the other two (Rome and Bern workshops) at the end of the year.

BvB remarked that the speed for publication is unusually high for such conference volumes and that all had been done to ensure both speed and quality. He felt both demands are met in the best way

GB informed that the prize of each book will be ca. 60 euro. He reminded of the 70 copies of each volume bought by COST and to be distributed freely. Some will be distributed to specific members of the MC who are particularly relevant in each case, the rest to libraries. GB had reached names and addresses of relevant libraries in ca. 10 countries but reminded the members of the MC to send him such addresses as soon as possible if they wanted copies to go to their countries

PB asked about review copies. GB and VP replied that they are being distributed by Brepols and a list of journals is made.

BvB remarked that it was decided in Zaragoza to number volumes 1-4 according to the original scheme (i.e. following the numbering of work groups), but to number all further volumes in order of actual appearance. This decision was confirmed by the MC.

BvB also suggested that a list be sent to all editors of steps to be taken before publication. This was decided and the core group given the task of making such a list.

## **5. Preparation for the final conference**

Before the discussions of the final conference JS remarked that no annual report was needed for 2008-2009, but a final report had to be submitted within 3 months after the final conference. She promised to provide links to reports from previous actions. The action would be evaluated by two rapporteurs, DK and one external.

DK urged all members to help the chairman in the work

MM underlined that the final report should include reports from the working groups.

After this GB turned to the final conference, which will take place in Gerona september 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup>. The themes of the four presentations had been discussed at the joint symposium friday. GB therefore turned to other questions.

### *Time scheme for presentation papers*

GB suggested that a detailed outline of points to be taken up in each paper be distributed by mid-april. After discussion pr. e-mail a first draft in full length should appear by mid-june and final papers ca. august 20<sup>th</sup>.

The leaders of the four groups preparing presentations (PRS, PSv, RS and RH) commented to this schedule. The suggested time schedules differed slightly, but the scheme was accepted. RH suggested an earlier date for the final version of paper, but GB did not find it realistic. PRS suggested a procedure where the outlines for the paper were first distributed to the members of each group for approval, then to the leaders of the other groups for coordination, and finally to all MC-members for further input, including suggestions of papers from the workshops relevant to each paper. He also suggested that the editors of the twelve volumes produced lists of all approved papers.

BvB took up the question of the character of the paper. After some discussion it was concluded that papers should be of roughly 4-5.000 words and present clear points and examples, but not have the form of an academic article with full references.

#### *Format of conference*

GB repeated the decisions made. The conference will consist of four sessions each starting with our planned presentation, then some kind of reply/comment from a podium, and then a general discussion. GB suggested 3-4 hours for each session.

JS and DK underlined that COST receives far more applications in relation to funds in the fields of humanities and social science. Therefore it is important that decision makers come and are convinced of the relevance of the actions and its results.

There was a lengthy discussion about the format. Some participants (Els , VP etc.) argued for rather long sessions giving good time to both decision makers and other experts. Others (RS, CPR; PB, JS etc.) argued for somewhat shorter sessions, making the whole conference last from monday morning till tuesday at lunch. RH argued that the four presentation groups would need to meet before the other participants in the conference, and he also argued for a final meeting of the members of the MC, discussing the future of the network. The MC concluded that the conference would start with working dinner for the four presentation groups sunday evening, the main conference last from monday morning till lunch at tuesday, and finally there would be a meeting for the members of the MC late tuesday afternoon. Some attempts were made to draft a time scheme, but it was decided to leave it to the core group to make a final plan.

Further it was decided to have presentations of ca. 30 minutes. There shall be comments from both other experts and decision makers. The exact distribution of this will be decided by the core group.

There was some discussion as to how both general points and specific results are included. The papers must present general points, but give specific examples. DK suggested posters. It was decided to invite some authors of papers from the previous workshops to make posters and present them shortly orally in an optional session where the participants could chose whom to listen to.

#### *Invitation of experts and decision makers*

GB meant there would be room/economy for about 70 participants in the conference of which roughly 30 would be members of the MC and attached experts, leaving room for 40 decision makers, journalists, and experts of other fields. All members of the MC were urged to send suggestions of names in these fields soon, so the core group can decide whom to invite.

RH pointed to the importance of including Eastern Europe which was not well represented at this meeting. VP stressed the importance of inviting the European commission, and RS stressed that this should include both the departments of agriculture and the environment. JS promised to try to find names of people to contact in these departments.

#### *Possible publication of papers from conference*

GB mentioned two possibilities: a volume 13 or publication in a journal. JS replied that it was in principle too late to request funds for an extra publication. There was also general agreement that publication in a journal would be better. D? replied that co-authored articles by authors from different countries published in a reputed journal would be well in line with the intention of costs. PRS suggested "Continuity and Change" as a possible channel of publication. GB concluded that a publication of longer and more academic versions of the four papers in a journal would be the aim.

## **6. Long-term planning**

RH gave a 'state of the arts' of European rural history networks. At the end of COST we will have the existing rural network of the ESSHC. The British Agricultural History Society arranges a congress in Brighton in 2010 and attempts to make a European event. A call for papers will appear on the web-site of the society soon. This should lead to continuous cooperation. One way would be to create an European Agricultural History Society with individual members, another to have a more informal network, where e.g. national associations in alternation undertook to arrange European Rural History congresses.

PB emphasized the usefulness of CORN and COST in bringing European rural historians together and the need for some kind of continuation. He saw a focused series of rural history congresses as a useful supplement to the ESSHC.

MM suggested making a session in Brighton based upon the Gerona papers.

DK mentioned Framework 7 and promised to see if it contained points relevant to our network.

## **7. Next meeting**

Already planned to take place in Gerona, September 8<sup>th</sup>. (see above, point 5)

## **8. AOB**

Nothing