

**Dan Matei** (Bucharest, Romania. [dan@cimec.ro](mailto:dan@cimec.ro))

NB. Sorry for my precarious English.

### **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?*

a) *Europeana* should return to the original goal of presenting the SIGNIFICANT European cultural heritage. In other words, the rush for quantity should be abandoned in favour of rush for quality.

b) A special effort should be invested in translating the descriptive metadata in as many languages as possible. Sure, this implies more effort from the Member States of "smaller" languages: 1) if they want their material to be fully enjoyed by the large European public, they have to provide metadata translations at least in the major languages and 2) if they want their local public to fully enjoy the material in the major languages, they have to translate its metadata in their vernacular language. C'est la vie.

c) *Europeana* should also include material of "European" significance from collections outside the EU (e.g. the Vatican collections, Hermitage Museum, Metropolitan Museum, Swiss and Turkish archives). EU should use some money to buy digital resources from this kind of collections. That would be not only a good cultural investment, but — symbolically — it would build a collection of "cultural assets", a public property of the whole Union.

### **Question 2**

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

The development of the "semantic layer" (i.e. the knowledge base) of *Europeana* should be given priority. A rich, multilingual semantic layer (the "*Europeana* Ontology") would offer many browsing and navigation facilities, much beyond the free text search. The development of this layer should start as soon as possible, via an online interface allowing the project partners to provide "authority data", e.g. names of personalities, place names, taxonomies, etc.

### **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?*

I strongly support the idea of a unified way of presenting the digital resources in *Europeana*. The link to the original location on the provider's site is NOT enough. If the resources are uniformly presented on the aggregators' sites (taken out of their "original context", i.e. the providers' sites), then they could be reused in virtual exhibitions, anthologies, etc. This could be the major "selling point" of *Europeana*.

If the resources are presented only on the providers' sites, then the *Europeana* portal is downgraded from a digital library to a union catalogue.

The provider's logo (within the item's metadata record) presented in the hit-list (after a search) and at the item level (on the aggregator's site), along with links to the provider's site is enough.

#### **Question 4**

*How should Europeana further develop its own autonomous identity?*

Those who re-use material from Europeana should be encouraged to attach the Europeana logo to the digital resource, when presenting it in another setting.

#### **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?*

Intellectual property: ideally, the Europeana content should be released either in public domain or under Creative Commons "Attribution" license.

Content: the digital resources exposed in Europeana should be "interpreted", i.e. they should be accompanied by rich descriptive metadata which provide the cultural context (e.g. no photo without textual description).

Europeana Office (maybe strengthened with a Pan-European scientific board) should be given the authority to impose standards (at any level). In other words, it should have even a bit more authority at European level than a national library has at national level.

#### **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?*

a) Historical texts and historical images (photos and artefacts). But the images should be offered with interpretation (i.e. context) and the metadata should be in the vernacular language and at least one of the major European languages (English, French, German, Spanish, Italian).

b) As much as possible culturally significant contemporary material.

#### **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?*

A "common European copyright law" (adapted to the present day !) would be the best incentive to expose in-copyright 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)?*

An (online) Pan-European Register of orphan works could help. Besides, orphan works should be licensed under Creative Commons "Attribution".

### **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?*

The good principle supported by the EC (something in public domain in analogue, should remain so in digital) should be imposed via a directive.

### **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?*

The Member States should impose the principle that all digital material produced on public money must be made freely accessible via *Europeana*.

### **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?*

I am against any "business model" for *Europeana* ! *Europeana* is not a business ! It is a most respectable public service, i.e. it is using public money in the most honourable way. Thus Europeana Office should be turned into an EU agency and financed directly from the EC budget. It should become the equivalent of a national library at the Union level.

### **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?*

Again: Europeana Office should be turned into an EU agency and financed directly from the EC budget.

### **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 current governance structure is OK, as far as I can see.

**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)?*

Private involvement should be kept at minimum. All the software should remain open source. Sponsoring (without advertisement) seems OK. Links to publishers' sites are OK too.

**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)?*

Logos of sponsors is enough.

**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?*

No. If the *Europeana* portal will help increase sales for cultural goods, good for Europeana. (If a public road helps the businesses around it, everybody's happy, right ?)