

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 28.8.2009

SEC(2009) 1124 final

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

accompanying the

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL
COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

on Europeana - next steps

Questions for consultation

General

Question 1

Which orientations would you suggest for the future development of Europeana as a common access point to Europe's cultural heritage in the digital environment?

Future development of Europeana should continue towards integration of all available digital content from museums, libraries, archives and audio visual collections from every Member State, including collections from wider Europe. Europeana should give access to paid-for material as well as unpaid.

Question 2

Which features should be given priority in the further development of the site?

Multilingualism should remain one of the top priorities in future. Availability of digitized content in various languages will facilitate searching.

Question 3

Has Europeana struck the right balance between making Europe's digitised cultural heritage searchable through a common entry point and at the same time giving visibility to the institutions that contribute the material, or should the material accessible through Europeana be presented in a more unified way?

In our view Europeana has, in terms of searching options, achieved adequate balance, and at the same time preserved identities of institutions as content providers.

Question 4

How should Europeana further develop its own autonomous identity?

Europeana should develop its autonomous identity with support from EU, in the way that all funded projects reinforce the central brand of Europeana.

Question 5

Should there be minimum requirements for the content brought into Europeana by the contributing organisations (e.g. minimum viewing or use options)? If so, who should be responsible for defining and imposing these minimum requirements?

Minimum requirements for content available through Europeana should be defined in order to make it easily searchable to users. Responsibility for defining these minimum requirements should be placed on a body consisting of representatives of all content providers.

Content for European

Question 6

Which categories of content are so important for the users that Member States and their cultural institutions should be encouraged to make them available through Europeana? What measures can be taken to ensure the availability of these works through Europeana?

Categories of content which are particularly relevant for users are current publications as well as cultural heritage of each Member State. Measures that can be taken to ensure availability of these works through Europeana involve further advancement of cultural heritage digitization processes.

Question 7

What is the best way to encourage cultural institutions and rightholders to take into account cross-border access - including through Europeana - in their agreements on digitisation and dissemination of in-copyright material? Which legal or practical barriers to this cross-border access need to be addressed?

Harmonization of copyright in Europe would encourage the cultural institutions and rightholders to participate in dissemination of in-copyright material. Review of the Berne Convention with specific reference to the Internet would provide for new legislation on usage of copyrighted material.

Question 8

How can the difference in the level playing field for digitising and making accessible older works between the US and Europe (in particular the 1923 cut-off date in the US, that places all material from before 1923 in the public domain) be addressed in a pragmatic way (e.g. better databases of orphan and out-of-print works, a cut-off point that imposes lower requirements for diligent search in relation to orphan works)?

Difference in the level for digitization can be handled in a pragmatic way by simplifying data for orphan and out-of-print works.

Question 9

What policies should be adopted to avoid that the process of digitisation itself creates new types of sui generis copyright that, in turn, could create barriers to the dissemination of digitised public domain material?

Harmonization of copyright in Europe would avoid that the process of digitization itself creates new types of sui generis copyright.

Question 10

*What measures can be taken to ensure that cultural institutions make their **digitised public domain material** accessible and usable in the widest possible way on the Internet? Should there be minimum requirements for the way in which digitised public domain content is made available through Europeana?*

Workshops designed for cultural institutions to instruct them on the methods and importance of online public presentation of their digital content.

Yes, there should be appropriate recommendations for minimum requirements for the way in which public domain content can be digitized.

Financing and governance

Question 11

Which financing model would reflect a fair distribution between Community funding, Member States' funding and private funding, taking into account that the aim of Europeana is to give the widest possible access to Europe's cultural heritage at pan-European level? Could Europeana be financed solely by national cultural institutions or by private funding?

Financing model is 100% European Union funding, including overhead costs. For the national cultural institutions' budget digitization of cultural heritage is of primary importance, therefore funding of Europeana by the national cultural institutions would produce future risk for the sustainability of Europeana.

Question 12

Is sustained European Union funding for the basic operations of Europeana necessary and justified for the period after 2013? What type of European funding instrument could best be used?

In respect of the fact that Europeana provides the most relevant achievements in the need for digitization and freedom of access to information equal to all, it seems necessary that the EU continues to fund Europeana.

Question 13

Which governance structure for Europeana would best fit the preferred financing model (as indicated under question 11)? Should there be a role in the governance structure for organisations other than content providers?

The governance structure of Europeana should comprise its major, long term and persistent stakeholders – the content providers.

Question 14

How can private involvement in Europeana best take shape (e.g. through sponsoring, through technological partnerships, through links from Europeana to the sites of

publishers and other rightholders where the user can buy in-copyright content, or through another type of partnership)?

Definitely it can best be done through sponsoring, technological partnership, links from Europeana to the sites of publishers and other right holders.

Question 15

How can private sponsorship of Europeana best be stimulated? Are commercial communications on the Europeana site acceptable, and, if so, what type of commercial communications (e.g. logos of sponsors, promotion of specific products)?

Commercial communications on the Europeana site are acceptable and could be carried out through promotions of special products.

Question 16

Should there be a contribution (financial or other) in exchange for the links from Europeana to sites with content for which the user has to pay? Can a model such as that of Gallica 2, providing links from the site of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France to the content on the sites of French publishers, be transposed to Europeana?

Yes, there should be a contribution. The Gallica 2 model is unsuitable for the distributed environment of Europeana because of the complexity of accounting procedures.