



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Communications Networks, Content and Technology

Media and Data
Creativity

**IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION
ON DIGITISATION AND ONLINE ACCESSIBILITY
OF CULTURAL MATERIAL AND DIGITAL PRESERVATION**

PROGRESS REPORT 2011-2013

**Please complete and return by e-mail to
Rachel.Soucher@ec.europa.eu no later than 31 October 2013**

Country	GREECE
----------------	---------------

Contact Details (info will not be published):

Name	Stefanos Kollias – George Bolanis
Organisation	NTUA - NMC
Telephone	00306977477162 - 00306995010950
Email	stefanos@cs.ntua.gr – gbolanis@gmail.com

NOTE: This template follows the structure of the Recommendation of 27 October 2011 on the digitisation and online accessibility of cultural material and digital preservation. This template should be strictly followed.

The Commission Recommendation was endorsed by Council on its Conclusion of 12 May 2012. The priority actions and indicative timetable contained in these Conclusions should clearly be taken into account in your reporting of progress.

Please note that particular attention should be given to new developments in the reference period 2011-2013, notably:

- Financial resources and quantitative/qualitative targets for digitisation
- Public-private partnerships for digitisation
- The transposition and implementation of the Directive 2012/28/EU of the European Parliament and the Council of 25 October 2012 on certain permitted uses of orphan works.
- Legislative or other actions taken by Member States to facilitate the large-scale digitisation of out-of-commerce works
- Actions taken by Member States to support Europeana (provision of content, funding, etc.)
- Measures taken by Member States to ensuring the wide and free availability of existing metadata produced by cultural institutions (Europeana Data Exchange Agreement)
- Financial and organisational aspects of digital preservation.

Besides your factual report, you are encouraged to raise any implementation problems or highlight any best practice examples to which you think special attention should be paid at national and/or European level. Where implementation is not fully reached, please describe how you plan to continue your work.

Please use the empty boxes underneath the questions to indicate your response/comments.

Please provide as much as possible quantitative indicators on progress achieved.

All reports will be published on the Commission's Digital Agenda for Europe website.

DIGITISATION: ORGANISATION AND FUNDING

1. PLANNING AND MONITORING OF THE DIGITISATION OF BOOKS, JOURNALS, NEWSPAPERS, PHOTOGRAPHS, MUSEUM OBJECTS, ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS, SOUND AND AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIAL, MONUMENTS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES ("CULTURAL MATERIAL")

- Is there a scheme to plan, coordinate and monitor digitisation of cultural material?

If yes, provide details of all relevant aspects of the scheme and of the overall digitisation achievements (number of digitised objects) towards the overall targets mentioned under point 7 (support to Europeana).

*Digitisation of cultural material is planned within the **National Programme for Digital Convergence 2007-2013**. This Programme, as is mentioned below, in the use of structural funds question, has already issued three Calls for Proposals and many projects have been accepted and have been currently producing new digital content. The **Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Tourism** is responsible for planning – in the framework of the Digital Convergence Programme - the digitisation and cultural developments related to the fields of museums, ancient monuments, contemporary art, theatre, cinematography and audiovisual archives. Fifty-six branches of the Ministry (Efories of Ancient Monuments) have been digitising and annotating their content during the last few years. The target of the Programme, regarding the amount of digital cultural content to be generated until 2016, if achieved, goes beyond the target for Greece set up under point 7 wrt Europeana.*

- Has your country set quantitative targets for the digitisation of cultural material?

If yes, please specify the targets and indicators/procedures for monitoring progress, if any.

Yes, through the Programme for Digital Convergence since 2011 there have been 2 calls for cultural content digitisation and services of about 75MEuro. There are yearly financial indicators for the achieved progress of the Programme (since there is use of structural funds).

- Has your country set qualitative targets for the digitisation of cultural material?

If yes, please specify the targets and indicators/procedures for monitoring progress, indicate the expected increase in digitised material which could form part of Europeana and budgets allocated by public authorities.

Regarding qualitative targets, for example, an important project (funded by 8 MEuro) is coordinated by the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and refers to digitisation & annotation of around 600.000 mobile objects belonging to the Efories of Ancient Monuments. Another project (funded by 9 MEuro) has as target the land registry and associated information generation for about 30.000 archaeological sites all around Greece.

Many projects in the above-mentioned Calls (with funding ranging from 200 to 300 KEuro) have been planned for digitisation and annotation of the cultural heritage possessed by small, medium or larger cultural organisations, museums, archives, institutions, all over Greece.

2. PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN ORDER TO CREATE NEW WAYS OF FUNDING DIGITISATION OF CULTURAL MATERIAL AND TO STIMULATE INNOVATIVE USES OF THE MATERIAL, WHILE ENSURING THAT PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR DIGITISATION ARE FAIR AND BALANCED, AND IN LINE WITH THE CONDITIONS INDICATED IN ANNEX I

- Have any cultural institutions in your country entered into PPPs (including also partnerships with non-EU partners) for digitisation or for facilitating the access to digital cultural heritage?

If yes, please provide details of the partnerships, compliance of the respective agreements with the conditions in Annex I of the Recommendation as well as contact details of the cultural institution involved.

There have started to appear such proposals that are currently under consideration for approval by the Hellenic Ministry of Culture.

One such group of possible PPPs refers to developing mobile information systems for usage in museums and other archaeological sites. A specific proposal has also been made in Delphi with the assistance of the Society of Diazoma. Other proposals for PPP have been made from Canada and from the Google-art project.

- Has your country adopted legislation on PPPs in place (e.g. fiscal benefits, public procurement provisions) or is any such legislation under preparation?

If yes, provide details and references.

A Legal Committee has been set up in the Hellenic Ministry of Culture which examines all aspects of the submitted proposals and provides their suggestion for accepting, modifying, or rejecting them to the Ministry.

3. USE OF STRUCTURAL FUNDS, WHERE POSSIBLE, TO CO-FINANCE DIGITISATION ACTIVITIES

- Is your country using Structural Funds for the digitisation of cultural material?

If yes, provide details of the amounts and the specific programmes.

Yes, structural funds have been used to co-finance Digitisation activities by the Digital Convergence Programme. Three Calls have been issued (Call 19 in 6/2010 with funding up to 70 MEuro; Call 31 in 10/2011 with funding up to 60 MEuro; Call 31.2 in 4/2012 with funding up to 15 MEuro. Absorption of funds in the latter two Calls has recently started to augment; many calls for digitisation & annotation tasks are currently implemented (e.g., American school of classical studies, archaeological school of Athens, collections of museums and archives).

4. OPTIMISE THE USE OF DIGITISATION CAPACITY AND ACHIEVE ECONOMIES OF SCALE, WHICH MAY IMPLY THE POOLING OF DIGITISATION EFFORTS BY CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS AND CROSS-BORDER COLLABORATION, BUILDING ON COMPETENCE CENTRES FOR DIGITISATION IN EUROPE.

- Has your country taken practical measures to optimise the use of digitisation capacity?

If yes, please provide details about the ways to optimise the use of digitisation capacity. Does this involve cross-border collaboration?

The main action taken has been to define common measures and obligations to use and follow existing schemes in all Calls for Proposals made within the Digital Convergence Programme.

DIGITISATION AND ONLINE ACCESSIBILITY OF PUBLIC DOMAIN MATERIAL

5. IMPROVE ACCESS TO AND USE OF DIGITISED CULTURAL MATERIAL THAT IS IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

5.1. Mechanisms to ensure that material in the public domain remains in the public domain after digitisation.

- Has your country encountered obstacles in the process of ensuring that material in the public domain stays in the public domain after digitisation?

If yes, please provide details of the obstacles and explain how they have been overcome or how they are being addressed.

This has been set as an obligation of all funded Cultural Organisations by the Digital Convergence Programme.

5.2. Widest possible access to digitised public domain material as well as the widest possible reuse of the material for non-commercial and commercial purposes.

- Are there projects or schemes for promoting the widest possible access to digitised public domain material?

If yes, please provide details.

The National Documentation Centre has been named as the Organisation responsible for signing agreements with all funded Organisations within Calls 31 and 31.2, so that it gathers metadata and, when possible, digitised content for aggregation and promotion purposes.

- Are there any schemes promoting reuse of the digitised material for non-commercial and commercial purposes? Please also indicate whether there are mechanisms for monitoring such reuse.

If yes, provide details of the schemes or best practice examples. Please also indicate whether there are mechanisms for monitoring such reuse (take-up by organisations engaging in re-use and take-up by end-users/visitors).

Not officially yet.

5.3. Measures to limit the use of intrusive watermarks or other visual protection measures that reduce the usability of the digitised public domain material.

- Has your country taken measures to limit the use of watermarks or other visual protection measures reducing the usability of digitised public domain material?

If yes, please describe the measures. Where applicable, please also indicate best/worst practice examples.

This requirement has been included in many calls for Proposals in the above-mentioned framework. However, not in a unified format, yet.

DIGITISATION AND ONLINE ACCESSIBILITY OF IN-COPYRIGHT MATERIAL

6. IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR THE DIGITISATION AND ONLINE ACCESSIBILITY OF IN-COPYRIGHT MATERIAL.

6.1. Rapid and correct transposition and implementation of the provisions of the Directive on orphan works

- When and how is your country going to transpose the Directive on orphan works?

For the moment, there is a draft bill for the amendment of Law 2121/1993 (Copyright Act), there is a provision regulating the orphan works.

6.2. Legal framework conditions to underpin licensing mechanisms identified and agreed by stake-holders for the large-scale digitisation and cross-border accessibility of works that are out-of commerce.

- Are there any legal/voluntary stakeholder-driven schemes in your country to underpin the large- scale digitisation and cross-border accessibility of digital cultural works?

If yes, please provide details of the schemes, references and describe impact.

These are issues considered by the Legal Committee of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture,

but no specific schemes have appeared yet.

6.3. Contributing to and promoting the availability of databases with rights information, connected at the European level, such as ARROW.

- How is your country contributing and promoting the availability of such databases at the European level?

No activity with specific outcomes.

EUROPEANA

7. CONTRIBUTE TO THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEANA

7.1. Encouraging cultural institutions as well as publishers and other right holders to make their digitised material accessible through Europeana, thus helping the platform to give direct access to 30 million digitised objects by 2015, including two million sound or audio-visual objects

- How is your country encouraging cultural institutions, publishers and other right holders to make their digitised material accessible through Europeana? Are there specific measures to encourage the contribution of sound or audio-visual material?

Greece has been a member state constantly contributing a) through the national Information Society and Digital Convergence Programmes b) through participation of many cultural organisations to Europeana; it constantly contributes around 1% of the increasing number of Europeana cultural objects. This is also the case today.

7.2. Making all public funding for future digitisation projects conditional on the accessibility of the digitised material through Europeana.

- What measures has your countries taken to ensure that all cultural material digitised by means of public funding will be accessible through Europeana?

In particular, in all the above-mentioned Calls for Proposals, which include the requirement that all material being digitised and annotated follows the metadata schemata used in Europeana, so that it can be contributed to Europeana.

7.3. Ensuring that all their public domain masterpieces will be accessible through Europeana by 2015,

- What measures has your country taken to ensure that your country's public domain masterpieces will be accessible through Europeana by 2015? Have you set indicators to measure progress?

All accepted projects assume that the masterpieces (or highlights) are the first to be digitised and included in the outcomes for dissemination.

7.4. Setting up or reinforcing national aggregators bringing content from different domains into Europeana, and contributing to cross-border aggregators in specific domains or for specific topics, this may bring about economies of scale.

- Has your country set up a national aggregator bringing content from different domains into Europeana? If yes, please provide details of the aggregator, participating organisations and content domains covered.

The National Documentation Centre plays the role of aggregator of cultural content in Calls 31, 31.2, as long as the Hellenic Ministry of Culture cannot play this role yet. Nevertheless, the Directorate of Ancient Archives of Monuments of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture has been responsible for the large projects of digitisation of mobile cultural objects and of the registration of the Hellenic archaeological sites; when these projects are completed, then the Directorate will be responsible for the aggregation of a very large part of the Hellenic digital cultural heritage.

Other aggregators that have greatly assisted aggregation of content in Greece include the Library of Veria, especially for aggregating content of public libraries, and the Hellenic Ministry of Education, as well as Organisations such as the University of Patras.

- Are there specific measures the participation of cultural institutions, publishers or other right holders in cross-border aggregators in specific domains or for specific topics? If no such measures have been taken, are you aware of voluntary participation by organisations based in your country? Please provide details of such participation and participants' motivation.

Many Greek Organisations participate in Europeana CIP projects, where they contribute with their content to ingestion to Europeana. Such projects include Athena Plus, LoCloud, Digital Contemporary Art, Linked Heritage, Carare, Europeana Fashion, 3-D Icons, EuScreenXL, Europeana Creative, Europeana Space, Europeana Sounds, Amrosia.

7.5. Ensuring the use of common digitisation standards defined by Europeana in collaboration with the cultural institutions in order to achieve interoperability of the digitised material at European level, as well as the systematic use of permanent identifiers.

- How does your country encourage the use of common digitisation standards defined by Europeana? How do you support the systematic use of permanent identifiers?

NTUA have implemented the MINT platform for interoperability, which has been used by almost 20 Europeana projects, as well as by Europeana in their ingestion procedures. In this framework there is currently under formation Europeana Greece, hosted by NTUA and focusing on content ingestion in (semantic) interoperable ways.

7.6. Ensuring the wide and free availability of existing metadata (descriptions of digital objects) produced by cultural institutions, for reuse through services such as Europeana and for innovative applications.

- Which measures has your country taken to ensure the wide and free availability of existing metadata? How do cultural institutions in your country take up the Europeana Data Exchange Agreement?
- What experience has your country been able to gather to re-use of free metadata for re-use if the underlying content through services such as Europeana or for innovative applications? Please provide details, examples and references.

Many cultural institutions have signed the Europeana Data Exchange Agreement, reducing in some cases (as in the case of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture) the number of metadata elements presented to the general public.

Enrichment services have been implemented in many of the above-mentioned projects, where cultural institutions and technological partners from Greece participate and contribute.

7.7. Establishing a communication plan to raise awareness of Europeana among the general public and notably in schools, in collaboration with the cultural institutions contributing content to the site.

- What measures has your country taken to establish a communication plan to raise awareness of Europeana? Are there specific measures targeting schools or other specific user communities? If yes, please provide details.

There has been a large project, entitled Digital School, which aims at providing all courses in school in digital format. Within this project, an activity has been implemented, using MINT, so that cultural content digitised in Greece by different providers, with a different metadata schema, or following EDM of Europeana, is compatible with the LOM (Learning object Model) Schema used by the Digital School platform, so that it can provide about 15% of the courses' educational material. This has been implemented, through technological collaboration of CTI and NTUA (<http://photodentro.edu.gr>); the current phase examines the agreement of such cultural organisations and possibly Europeana to provide such content to Digital School platform.

DIGITAL PRESERVATION

8. REINFORCE NATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR THE LONG-TERM PRESERVATION OF DIGITAL MATERIAL, UPDATE ACTION PLANS IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIES, AND EXCHANGE INFORMATION WITH EACH OTHER ON THE STRATEGIES AND ACTION PLANS.

- Does your country have a strategy for the long-term preservation of digital material? What actions are you planning to implement the strategy? Have you exchanged

information with other Member States in order to devise your strategy and action plan? If yes, please provide details.

The situation still is described as follows: Although it has been accepted by all major “players” that standardizing digital preservation practices will advance the level of all projects in the area and will bring content to the user at the proper level of service, we cannot say that Greece has reached the maturity needed to have an established strategy and targets to be met – unanimously set.

9. EXPLICIT AND CLEAR PROVISION IN YOUR COUNTRY'S LEGISLATION SO AS TO ALLOW MULTIPLE COPYING AND MIGRATION OF DIGITAL CULTURAL MATERIAL BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS FOR PRESERVATION PURPOSES, IN FULL RESPECT OF EUROPEAN UNION AND INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.

- Have your country made explicit and clear provision in its legislation to allow multiple copying and migration of digital cultural material by public institutions for preservation purposes?

The situation still is as follows: Greek Law allows the reproduction of only one additional copy. However, since the provision (Article 22 Law 2121/1993) clarifies that the reproduction can be made for the purpose of retaining that additional copy or for transferring it to another non-profit making library or archive, the number of copies can be increased, if we accumulatively apply both the purposes of reproduction. In this case one copy will be retained and as many copies as the libraries or the archives ask for will be produced.

The provision of Article 22 does not limit the means of reproduction. Consequently the way of reproduction is irrelevant (analog or digital) and there could even be a format shift. Therefore, the digital reproduction of works already in the permanent collection of libraries or archives for the purposes that are defined by law is possible if all the conditions of Article 22 and 28 C (three steps test) Law 2121/1993 are met.

10. MAKE THE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE DEPOSIT OF MATERIAL CREATED IN DIGITAL FORMAT IN ORDER TO GUARANTEE ITS LONG-TERM PRESERVATION, AND IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF EXISTING DEPOSIT ARRANGEMENTS FOR MATERIAL CREATED IN DIGITAL FORMAT.

- 10.1. Ensuring that right holders deliver works to legal deposit libraries without technical protection measures, or that, alternatively, they make available to legal deposit libraries the means to ensure that technical protection measures do not impede the acts that libraries have to undertake for preservation purposes, in full respect of European Union and international legislation on intellectual property rights.
- What arrangements has your country made to ensure that technical protection measures do not impede the acts that libraries have to undertake to guarantee long-term preservation of material created in digital format?

The situation is still as follows: The most common way of establishing the proper level of

exchanging information on digital preservation plans and strategies is the participation of our organizations in multinational, multicultural programs and projects, where the participants are obliged to:

- Accept technology standards on digitization*
 - Develop relevant knowledge in the country technical field and*
 - Operate as technology and methodology ambassadors in and out of the country.*
- For a small country like Greece that could not have the critical mass to behave out of the stream, this approach seems as the only way of aligning practices to standards and becoming part of the international momentum in the area..*

10.2. Where relevant, making legal provision to allow the transfer of digital legal deposit works from one legal deposit library to other deposit libraries that also have the right to these works.

- Has your country made legal provision to allow the transfer of digital legal deposit works from one legal deposit library to other deposit libraries that also have the right to these works? If yes, please provide details.

Not yet.

10.3. Allowing the preservation of web-content by mandated institutions using techniques for collecting material from the Internet such as web-harvesting, in full respect of European Union and international legislation on intellectual property rights.

- What measures has your country adopted to allow preservation of web-content by mandated institutions? Please provide details, e.g. of the types of web-content preserved and the organisations mandated.

Not yet.

11. TAKING INTO ACCOUNT DEVELOPMENTS IN OTHER MEMBER STATES, WHEN ESTABLISHING OR UPDATING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE DEPOSIT OF MATERIAL ORIGINALLY CREATED IN DIGITAL FORMAT, IN ORDER TO PREVENT A WIDE VARIATION IN DEPOSITING ARRANGEMENTS.

- How is your country taking into account developments in other Member States in order to prevent a wide variation in deposition arrangements? Please provide details.

The Hellenic Ministry of Culture, the Hellenic Ministry of Education, the National Documentation Centre participating in European projects take these into account when considering their new policies.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- Please indicate in the box below any suggestions or other comments you would like to make, or any further information you consider of use for the purposes of this progress report and/or the further implementation of the Recommendation.

