

Question 2

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

Answer

- 2.1. Closer consultation with academics at an institutional level would provide possibility to define Europeana's position in relation to teaching, learning and research strategies.
- 2.2. Europeana should increase the chance that the user finds all he/she wants to find, by giving the user greater guidance in accessing the material. This may include, for example, pre-defining (thematic) sets, or offering filtering, or introducing some other form of query guiding.
- 2.3. *Multilingualism* should remain a high priority.
- 2.4. *Data enrichment*.

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?

Answer

- 3.1. It is important that Europeana gives access to a *critical mass* of materials in order to be relevant.
- 3.2. *Research libraries* have a great deal to offer both in terms of historic material and new academic content. Europeana should include these new types of material, which will then be available to the European user via a common interface. Europeana should also make use of this opportunity to exploit the research and educational networks to which these research libraries have access.
- 3.3. Open Access and Creative Commons should be the guidelines for *accessibility*.

Question 4

How should Europeana further develop its own autonomous identity?

Answer

- 4.1. Europeana should become a strong brand both for libraries and for European students, researchers and citizens. It has to demonstrate the quality of the materials it makes available, and the quality of the access and retrieval. The digital objects participating institutions produce are regarded as trustworthy resources by ensuring the physical and digital provenance of the metadata related to the digital object.
- 4.2. Materials accessible through Europeana should also become much more *visible* through Google and other search engines.
- 4.4. *Long-term preservation and access*. Libraries who already have experience with long-term preservation tools and content should play the major role in preserving European

materials available via Europeana and in guaranteeing perpetual access to that content to the European user.

- 4.5. Play an *incentive role* in the digitisation of material relevant for European culture and not yet available in digital format.

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?

Answer

- 5.1. Minimum requirements should be defined by Europeana. There should be a clearly stated use and re-use policy together with an agreed *Open Access* policy. Publicly-financed digital content should remain in the public domain; the use of privately-funded digital content should be defined by the fundraising body and copyright material should be accessed according to a legal framework harmonised at a European level and in the individual Member States.
- 5.2. All data should comply with one of the current *world standards* for Library, Museum, Archive and Audiovisual materials.
- 5.4. Organisations or aggregators submitting data to Europeana should use OAI-PMH or OpenSearch.

Content for Europeana

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?

Answer

- 6.1. Early printed books and manuscripts. Genealogy and portraits. Photographs, postcards, films. Modern material like newspapers and also current publications.
- 6.2. *Primary data.*
- 6.3. Documents that are important for the history of a country (e.g. treaties, laws, charters) and for the cross-border history of Europe. Documents on local traditions (e.g. costumes, songs, architecture, cooking). The artistic outputs of iconic artists, composers, and writers from each European country. Views and videos/film of the landscapes and cities.

Question 7

What is the best way to encourage cultural institutions and right holders 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?

Answer

- 7.1. Libraries would need assistance in *negotiating favourable digitisation contracts* with private companies. All information, including full text, images (even if not at the highest resolution) and metadata should be made as freely available as possible through Europeana.
- 7.2. Europeana should have an *advocacy* strategy to make content providers and rights holders aware of the relevant copyright issues. There should be a unified policy of Open Access.
- 7.3. The challenge of *copyright* in Europe is that legislation exists at both European and national levels.

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)?

Answer

- 8.1. *Orphan works* are particularly difficult. The current approach in many European countries is not to digitise material where the rights holders cannot be traced. Inevitably, such an approach will lead to the creation of a mass of orphan works, works which an individual would like to have digitised but where the rights cannot be cleared.
- 8.3. The roles and responsibilities in creating this new copyright landscape remain to be discussed, although it is clear that Europeana has a major role to play and that it is the EU itself which must lead the discussion.

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?

Answer

- 9.1. The EU should develop policies which are more explicit on access to materials which are digitised. Where digitisation takes place with funding from the EU or other public bodies in Member States, the resulting digitised materials should be available in Open Access. The EU has already taken this step in terms of secondary publications which are the output of EU-funded projects. It is a relatively small step to extend this principle to digitisation outputs and we recommend that the EU does indeed take this step.

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?*

Answer

- 10.1. Libraries will use the Europeana platform to publish their materials if they feel the context is appropriate; it will increase their visibility and will strengthen their position. Communication with content providers therefore is of the greatest importance.
- 10.2. Provide more funding through EU funding streams, e.g. e-content for shared European *subject-oriented digitisation*, the outputs of which will be available via Europeana.

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?

Answer

- 11.1. Europeana should become the principal European gateway to Europe's digital content. As such, it is appropriate that *European structural funds* in each of the Member States be used to provide sustainable financial support for Europeana.
- 11.2. Individual Member States' primary responsibility should be to fund *national digitisation and national digital libraries to aggregate content* for 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?

Answer

- 12.1. Structural funding for Europeana should be part of the European *long-term strategy* for Europeana in order to ensure continuity in building meaningful digital collections.

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?

Answer

- 13.1. The following parties should be represented in the Europeana *governance structure*: content providers, users (including students and researchers) Europeana executives, private companies, funding agencies, and representatives from the EU.

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 right holders where the user can buy in-copyright content, or through another type of

partnership)?

Answer

- 14.1. Europeana should take every opportunity to make its materials *more visible and ready for sharing and re-use*, both in a non-commercial context (integration into education and research), but also in commercial environments. Europeana should integrate with services provided by commercial companies such as search engines (e.g. Google Books and OCLC-WorldCat), online booksellers (like Amazon, but also local booksellers), companies selling high quality images, audio and video files.
- 14.2. Europeana should *go out to where the user is* rather than creating more and more services where the user has to come to Europeana.

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)?

Answer

- 15.1. The first condition for sponsorship for Europeana is that Europeana will have to be able to show its value and a broad user base. Europeana will never be able to attract sponsors if sponsors do not receive sufficient *visibility*.
- 15.2. Europeana should be funded with *Structural Funds* by the EU, and to a lesser degree by commercial companies.

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?

Answer

- 16.1. Europeana should remain the place where users know they can find *free content*. Europeana should be the international showcase for European public cultural institutions. It is in this context that links to paying services that provide added value to the free content in Europeana should be encouraged.

dr. Marija Prokopčik
Director for information activities and heritage
Vilnius university library

13 November 2009