



HEIRNET

FISH-HEIRNET

Minutes of the Spring Meeting, Historic England Office, Waterhouse Square, London

9th June 2017, 11.00 – 16:00

Present: David Thomas, (RCAHMW & FISH Convenor), Dan Miles, HE (FISH Co-ordinator), Phil Carlisle (HE), Keith May (HE), Sarah Poppy (HE), Graham Tait (Coventry CC), Kieron Niven (ADS), Peter McKeague (RCAHMS), Chris Martin (CPAT), Sally Croft (NMW), Edonis Jesus (Lendlease & BIM4Heritage interest group), Sarah Delaney (NBS), Noha Saleeb (Middlesex University), Donna Robinson (NT)

1. Welcome and Apologies

Apologies were received from Hugh Corley (IMSIG)

2. Minutes and Actions of the last meeting

3. Matters Arising

No matters arising

Presentations from this meeting are available online at <http://heritage-standards.org.uk/fish-heirnet/>

4. BIM4Heritage Presentations and discussion on BIM and mapping heritage terminologies

4.1 BIM for the Historic Environment (Edonis Jesus - BIM Leader for Lendlease Consulting and chair of the BIM4Heritage interest group)

BIM has been identified as a measure to tackle the issue of poor performance in terms of productivity within the Architecture, Engineering & Construction (AEC) industry . BIM is process and technology enabling digital representation of physical and functional characteristics; whole life approach (concept to operation); consistency and standardisation; shared knowledge and enhanced decision making.

Why BIM for the Historic Environment?

Support activities to the understanding and preservation of the historic built environment; support CRM assessments and decision making; support conservation, restoration, rehabilitation, repair and maintenance activities; assist archaeological/structural analysis; support the management of Heritage Information; improve communication with the public - Digital representation of historic structures; demonstrate safe methods of working, logistics planning and movement & capture knowledge.

BIM is all about information and heritage information is the basis for the understanding and preservation of the historic environment. The key benefit of BIM is to allow all information to be kept in a single model or environment.

The vision of the BIM4Heritage Group is to provide a forum for organisations and industry professionals to share knowledge and lessons learnt on BIM applied to historic structures. The purpose is to promote the learning, awareness and understanding of BIM within the conservation and heritage sector of the built environment, and to influence and integrate this with wider industry needs. The group involves a range of disciplines and conservators who have the current stewardship of the existing building stock, it will also aim to enable industry to understand the importance of information relating to conservation requirements.

For the EJ's presentation see: <http://heritage-standards.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/FISH-Presentation--June-2017.pdf>

There was a brief discussion on the issues of archiving the products of BIM.

4.1.1 Action on KN to become a representative of ADS on BIM4Heritage group

4.2 UNICLASS: as it lives and breathes (Sarah Delany, Head of Classification and Technical Author, NBS)

SD gave a presentation introducing UNICLASS, its origins, aims and how it is structured. It was created as a government requirement to develop a classification to aid the adoption of BIM. The aim was to allow project information to be structured to a recognised standard; to be comprehensive for all stages in a project life cycle; to be applicable to building and infrastructure sectors; to be dynamic, managed and maintained and to be up to date and relevant.

SD explained the classification system going through the different levels, associations and links, for example classes of information, group headings, elements/ functions and Systems tables. The reasons for why the classification system was set up and the coding system were explained and she went through examples. SD finished that UNICLASS is a dynamic classification system and needs the input from the heritage sector

UNICLASS tables are available through the website and to download in excel format.

There was a brief discussion on the differences between the use of a classification system (UNICLASS) and thesauri (heritage vocabularies) between PC and SD.

For SD's presentation see: <http://heritage-standards.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/nbs-classification-and-uniclass-table-examples.pdf>

4.3 Historic Environment thesauri and UNICLASS - an exploratory mapping (Peter McKeague, Historic Environment Scotland)

PM introduced his talk saying that there was a need for Historic Environment Scotland to use BIM to manage its estate and therefore there was a business case to look at the relationship between UNICLASS and heritage vocabularies that are used in systems used to manage the historic environment. PM spoke about some preliminary work he had undertaken to map UNICLASS with heritage vocabularies from heritagedata.org – in particular the monument, component and buildings material thesauri. He first explained where the thesauri were available and how they were set out. He then explained about how he had made a preliminary and scoping mapping between the monuments thesaurus and UNICLASS Entities and Complexes, and the buildings material and components thesauri and UNICLASS products. PM showed that although there is an aligning between existing vocabularies across the heritage thesauri and UNICLASS values a large number of heritage terms do not appear in UNICLASS. There are also gaps in activities, elements, concepts and potentially condition (eg weathering).

The issues raised by PM were discussed. The group discussed the different approaches used to create UNCLASS and heritage vocabularies, gaps, issues and potential ways forward. The business case for doing a mapping was suggested by DT to be for asset management and long term data preservation. However, PC thought it was a large task to map all the terms and wasn't viable until the creation of the Thesaurus of Cultural Heritage. Though there is a need now for BIM and UNICLASS. The potential of skosifying UNICLASS and creating PURLs was discussed which would help mapping to heritage vocabularies.

Work is needed to scope out the issues and begin mapping. As there is a perceived business need this could be taken forward by HES.

4.3.1 Action on PM to scope out mapping between UNICLASS and heritage vocabularies in association with HES colleagues, SD and involving FISHTWG and Paul Bryan (HE) (report back to November meeting).

For PM's presentation see: <http://heritage-standards.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Terminologies-for-HBIM-FISH.pdf>

5. Controlled vocabularies – OASIS & Research Frameworks (Peter McKeague (HES) & Dan Miles (HE))

DM and PM spoke about the need to make sure that the terminologies being used in OASIS were the most up to date and those that are now on Heritagedata.org (skosified terminologies). The process to add terms or update the lists needs to be clearer and more transparent. DM spoke about confusion over who was responsible for creating terminologies and the role of FISH in this.

PM also asked PC about the potential change of Monument higher level terms as these terms are being used to index regional research frameworks in Scotland and in England. Research Frameworks in England are being closely tied into OASIS with automatic updaters which means that they will be indexed with the same terminologies that are used in OASIS (and HERs).

PC answered that the higher level terms were being changed as conceptually they are at the moment a work around. This will be part of the work on the TCH and is a few years away.

5.1 Action on DM to go to the next meeting of FISHTWG and discuss the issues with changing the higher level terms.

5.2 Action on DM, PM and SP to coordinate with the ADS on the lists and terminologies being used in OASIS and confirm they are fit for purpose

5.3 Action on DM to go to the next meeting of FISHTWG and discuss how the OASIS work can be organised

6. FISHTWG – update and the Thesaurus of Cultural Heritage (TCH) – (PC)

PC spoke about progress on the project to develop the TCH. It now has to become an internal HE project with Heritagedata.org coming inside. To achieve this various strands of work are required with HE IMT staff and the development of the Reference Data Manager (potentially using ARCHES). This work is being planned and is likely 2018-19.

PC, DT and PM said there were no issues for RCHMW or HES as long as the Firewall and permissions are all sorted out.

DM, PM and PC spoke about the timetable of the TCH with regard to creating the combined thesauri and the development of OASIS, as OASIS is being developed this summer with an ALPHA version in March. The work to combine the main RCAHMW, HES and HE lists needs to be done now, in advance of the TCH to provide combined skosified lists for OASIS.

6.1 Action on PC, PM and DT to take forward the mapping of the monument thesauri

6.2 Action on PC to check if Ceri Binding has already done this and datestamp it and circulate this to DT and PM

7. Update on HIAS (including HERALD)

SP and KM gave an update on HIAS and talked about the work being undertaken on the historic built environment and marine. Work has identified the need for updates and changes to terminologies that need

to be addressed. KM spoke about HERALD and the need to have a definitive list of research frameworks for this.

7.1 Action on DM to coordinate with ADS and provide a list of research frameworks

7.2 Action on SP to be responsible for any potential changes to historic built environment terminologies and feed this back to FISHTWG and OASIS project team.

8. Websites

No updates. But a reiteration that any changes or updates in terminologies and workflows needs to be highlighted and promoted through the FISH website.

9. Reports from Contributing Organisations

Wales

DT and CM spoke about the impact of the Historic Environment Act (Wales) Act, and commented that this had been the focus of work for the Trusts and RCAHMMW over the past year. This has included ensuring that the HERs fulfil their role as defined in the Act, and, for RCAHMMW, the development of a list of historic place names. SC spoke about how they were looking at ways of promoting the role of HERs to other bodies, eg individual academic and academic institutions.

Scotland

PM gave an update to the group including the work of a Scottish archaeology data group on polygon standards. PM also spoke about his close involvement with developing the functional specification for the new OASIS and that the next Scottish regional research framework project (SESARF) had begun.

Action on PM to send out the draft polygon standard to the group for comment

Historic England

PC updated the group on the First World War project which is linking various resources including the War Memorial website, the Imperial War Museum and the National Heritage List for England (NHLE). HE staff created the links and an API to achieve this. Although Scotland and Wales aren't involved in this PM said that it would be interesting to look at from a Scottish perspective. DT and PC spoke about this approach being a great example of how datasets should be linked up – linking both ways. GT asked about the potential of linking to HERs, this would be a good thing to look forward at.

DM updated that the Historic England corporate plan was out (just after Purdah), that the HE Research Agenda is nearly out and that there is a sectoral guidance survey out. DM spoke about how he is now undertaking a project to look at sector reference resources (reference collections etc..) and DM and PC spoke about the recent ceramic type series workshop held in Worcester on April 29th. PC said that he was looking at the potential use of ARCHES to build a linked up database of pottery types.

National Trust

DR said that the user figures of the NT heritage online resource showed that it was being used very well, with lots of volunteers updating monitoring data – 800 monument records have been enhanced...

ADS

KN updated on ADS. The main updates were that the ADS Digital Library is now live as a BETA format. The Historic Landscape Characterisation datasets are also now being archived.

10. AOB

GT said that the ALGAO lists are now on the FISH website but now it needs to be discussed who is responsible for updating these etc...

DT said that we need to look at the roles and responsibilities of FISH. We need to look at the terms of reference of FISH and review whether this is still fit for purpose. DM also said there was a need to look at the whole area of updating terminologies (processes, flow lines, responsibilities and transparency)

10.1 Action on DT to review the FISH Terms of Reference

10.2 Action on PC to review the FISHTWG Terms of Reference

10.3 Action on DM Action to produce a draft of FISH processes and flow lines

PM asked about the availability of the Monument Class Descriptions (MCDs) which he believes are still very useful. PC said that they had been superseded by the Introductions to Heritage Assets (IHAs) and the Designation Guides and a corporate decision had been made not to publish these. PC will send PM a spreadsheet of the MCDs as he requires some of these.

10.4 Action on PC to send PM the spreadsheet of MCDs

KM reported that as a response to the discussion on potential European engagement with FISH at the FISH-HERINET strategic meeting in November he was organising a session at the European Archaeology Association conference in Maastricht for September 2017. DM is doing a presentation on the role of FISH and will circulate this for comment and suggestions before the conference.

10.5 Action on DM to circulate the abstract of KM's session & DM's abstract

DM brought up an AOB emailed in by Edmund Lee asking about what to do with the MoRPHE Project Planning note "Developing Controlled Vocabularies" guidance that is now out of date. EL has suggested that he could shorten this to a simple specification of the project stages and products which could then be

published on the FISH website after consultation and approval of FISH. (see appendix 2 for full email proposal).

The group agreed that this was the best way forward.

10.6 Action on Edmund Lee to undertake this rewriting guidance in correspondence with FISH

DT agreed the next Strategic FISH-HEIRNET meeting would be hosted by RCAHMW in Aberystwyth

10.7 Action on DM and DT to organise the next strategic meeting.

Appendix 1 Open Actions

No	Joint FISH/HEIRNET Spring meeting: 8 th June 2015	Owner	Notes
7.1	Action to establish a FISH communication strategy.	DM	Open
No	Joint FISH/HEIRNET Spring meeting: 8 th June 2016	Owner	Notes
4.1	Action to build a review of the MIDAS Heritage HER Compliance profile into the relevant HIAS work package	SP	
No	Joint FISH/HEIRNET Spring meeting: 9 th June 2017	Owner	Notes
4.1.1	Action on to become a representative of ADS on BIM4Heritage group	KN	
4.3.1	Action to scope out mapping between UNICLASS and heritage vocabularies in association with HES colleagues, SD and involving FISHTWG and Paul Bryan (HE) (report back to November meeting).	PM	
5.1	Action to go to the next meeting of FISHTWG and discuss the issues with changing the higher level terms.	DM	

5.2	Action to coordinate with the ADS on the lists and terminologies being used in OASIS and confirm they are fit for purpose	DM, PM and SP	
5.3	Action to go to the next meeting of FISHTWG and discuss how the OASIS work can be organised	DM	
6.1	Action on to take forward the mapping of the monument thesauri	PC, PM and DT	
6.2	Action to check if Ceri Binding has already mapped the terminologies with date stamp and circulate this to DT and PM	PC	
7.1	Action to coordinate with ADS and provide a list of research frameworks	DM	
7.2	Action to be responsible for any potential changes to historic built environment terminologies and feed this back to FISHTWG and OASIS project team.	SP	
10.1	Action to review the FISH Terms of Reference	DT	
10.2	Action to review the FISHTWG Terms of Reference	PC	
10.3	Action to produce a draft of FISH processes and flow lines	DM	
10.4	Action to send PM the spreadsheet of MCDs	PC	
10.5	Action to circulate the abstract of KM's session & DM's abstract	DM	

10.6	Action to undertake this rewriting guidance in correspondence with FISH	Edmund Lee (DM to email)	
10.7	Action to organise the next Strategic meeting in November.	DM and DT	

Appendix 2

Hi Phil, thanks for your thoughts this pm... I'll get this added to the FISH agenda. (Dan to note as AOB for the 9th June)

As part of my sections work on the published suite of Historic England guidance that is still currently in English Heritage brand, I'm looking at the MoRPHE Project Planning Notes. You'll recall that this includes your PPN 'Developing Controlled Vocabularies', published back in 2006 available at <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/morphe-project-planning-note-2/>

I'm proposing that these PPNs are either:-

1. Archived offline, if the subject matter is no longer relevant
2. Radically shortened to a simple specification of the project stages and products, with other organisations / teams approached to take responsibility for publishing any additional material contained in the existing PPN

I'd welcome your thoughts as to which of these options would work best for Developing Controlled Vocabularies.

I'm thinking that option 2 would be best. There are still terminology projects that need doing, (particularly coming from the archaeological excavation / archive records community) and probably HE will be looked to fund these, so we need a short specification / checklist.. I would develop the simple table of stages / products for you/ FISH to approve, with FISH taking on responsibility for publishing and maintaining any additional guidance contained in the existing text, e.g. on <http://heritage-standards.org.uk/terminology/>.

All good wishes,

Ed