Leiden, 19 March 2014

# Subject │ Minutes of the 1st Meeting of Working Group 1 - Integrated interface to European dictionary content - of COST Action IS1305 “European Network of e-Lexicography (ENeL)”

**at Leiden University, Sterrenwachtlaan, Leiden (The Netherlands)**

**on 16 January 2014, from 14h00 till 15h45**

1. **Opening and Welcome**

Anne DYKSTRA (chair of WG1) opens the WG meeting and welcomes the participants.

1. **Appointment of Minute Secretary**

No minute secretary is appointed. Carole TIBERIUS will take the minutes of the first meeting.

1. **Introduction by WG1 members**

Anne DYKSTRA asks the audience to reflect for approximately 5 minutes on what WG1 tries to establish on the basis of the questions that were included in the agenda for this meeting as given in **Annex 1**. After that the participants of the meeting introduce themselves and give ‘tentative’ answers to the questions formulated.

*Short biographies will be collected for COST ENeL for the website. Therefore the short introductions will not be included in the minutes.*

Summarising:

* *What should a European dictionary portal that will give information on scholarly dictionaries of the languages of Europe look like? Should the contents of European dictionaries be interlinked? Is that possible at all? Should we make do with a portal that merely provides links to individual dictionaries? Consider here also one of the goals of WG4: Developing ways in which already existing information from single language dictionaries can be displayed and interlinked to represent more adequately their common European heritage.*

Some are very optimistic about the possibilities of creating a portal in which the dictionaries are **link**ed to each other. Technically this is indeed possible, but most likely separate funding will be needed to realise an extensively linked portal.

A step-by-step approach seems to be preferred within this COST Action, starting from a portal containing hyperlinks to the different dictionaries, then gradually expand the functionality.

A decision needs to be made on **which dictionaries** are going to be included in the portal. One of the goals of the COST Action is to make scholarly dictionaries more visible. To this end an overview of all (scholarly) dictionaries is going to be made including metadata (i.e. number of entries, encoding – XML schema + documentation – format for description to be defined). This will be coordinated with WG2 where a similar initiative has been discussed.

* *Do we need a user requirements study before we can start thinking about developing an interface?*

The opinions on the usefulness of **user research** are mixed. Some are rather pessimistic about whether user studies are possible at all for such a portal as the portal is meant to be for a wide range of users, including lay men and professionals. However, user studies may help us to decide what needs to be linked.

* *How and when do we seek collaboration with the other three WGs with respect to user-interfaces to the dictionary data?*

Inter Working Group communication is discussed and how this can best be organised, e.g. through a forum on the website, a wiki (cf. kELLY project?), google docs and mailing list. No decision is made.

* *What standards should we use?*

We need to cooperate with WG2 for encoding standards.

* *What can crowd sourcing do for the portal? How should it be organized?*

The opinions on **crowd sourcing** are also mixed keeping in mind quality. Crowd sourcing can be useful and is used in various projects, e.g. Andrew HAWKE mentions the use of crowd sourcing for capturing place names. After three people agree, a status update is made. Within the context of the portal crowd sourcing could maybe be used for validating links between the dictionaries using a voting system. Another suggestion is to ask the user to provide information when no result is given. This is for instance done in the Basque dictionaries.

Other issues that are discussed are data security, maintenance of the portal after the COST Action has ended.

1. **Evaluation of the previous item**

Anne DYKSTRA and Bob BOELHOUWER will formulate suggestions on the basis of the minutes.

1. **Division of tasks and forming subgroups**

It is suggested that the meeting in the Lorentz Center could be used to make good progress with the dictionary portal. Same applies to STSMs. STSMs could also be used to carry out work in the context of WG1.

1. **How to identify future funding sources and develop collaborative funding applications**

There is a prize for best open data. Maybe the portal could qualify for this prize in the future.

Possibilities of future funding should be listed on the website.

1. **AOB**

There is no AOB

1. **Closing**

Anne DYKSTRA closes the meeting at 15h40.

**Annex 1**

Agenda Meeting in Leiden on 16 January 2014

WG1 Integrated interface to European dictionary content

1. Opening and Welcome
2. Appointment Minute Secretary
3. Introduction by WG1 Members

The idea is that members inform each other of their background (affiliation, lexicographer, computer linguist, programmer, etc.) and that every member will briefly reflect on the tasks of WG1 on the basis of the following questions, keeping in mind the main goal of WG1, namely to make accessible authoritative dictionary information on the languages of Europe to both the general and academic public:

* What should a European dictionary portal that will give information on scholarly dictionaries of the languages of Europe look like? Should the contents of European dictionaries be interlinked? Is that possible at all? Should we make do with a portal that merely provides links to individual dictionaries? Consider here also one of the goals of WG4: Developing ways in which already existing information from single language dictionaries can be displayed and interlinked to represent more adequately their common European heritage.
* Do we need a user requirements study before we can start thinking about developing an interface?
* How and when do we seek collaboration with the other three WGs with respect to user-interfaces to the dictionary data?
* What standards should we use?
* What can crowd sourcing do for the portal? How should it be organized?

Remember that the questions are just there to get an initial idea of where we are and where we might want to go. Feel free to bring up items that the questions do not cover.

1. Evaluation of the previous item.
2. Division of tasks and forming subgroups. Please consider if there is any specific task that you, or your institute is willing to accept.
3. How do we identify future funding sources and develop collaborative funding applications?
4. Any other business
5. Closing

**Annex 2**

**Members of WG1 Integrated interface to European dictionary content**

Mr. Anne Dykstra (Netherlands) **Chair**

Mr. Bob Boelhouwer (Netherlands) **Vice Chair**

Mrs. Viola Baumann (Hungary)

Mr. Vladimir Benko (Slovakia)

Mrs. Klara Ceberio (Spain)

Mrs. Éva Dömötör (Hungary)

Mrs. Anna Dziemianko (Poland)

Mr. Andrew Hawke (UK)

Mr. Kristian Kankainen (Estonia)

Mr. Iztok Kosem (Slovenia)

Mr. Igor Leturia (Spain)

Mr. Robert Lew (Poland)

Mrs. Veronika Lipp (Hungary)

Mr. Márton Petykó (Hungary)

Mr. Klaas Ruppel (Finland)

Mrs. Tanneke Schoonheim (Netherlands)

Mr. Daniel Schopper (Austria)