



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 2013-2015

**Please complete and return by e-mail to
Rachel.Soucher@ec.europa.eu no later than 30 October 2015**

Country	The Netherlands
----------------	------------------------

Contact Details (info will not be published):

Name	Tjeerd de Boer
Organisation	Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap
Telephone	+31 (0)6 15038422
Email	t.w.deboer@minocw.nl

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 your report should focus on new developments in the reference period 2013-2015.

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

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 provide quantitative indicators on progress achieved, where applicable.

If no information is available for a question, please leave the corresponding box empty.

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

DIGITISATION: ORGANISATION AND FUNDING

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

a. Setting clear quantitative targets for the digitisation of cultural material, in line with the overall targets mentioned under point 7, indicating the expected increase in digitised material in Europeana and the budgets allocated by public authorities

- Is a national strategy or other scheme in place for planning the digitisation of cultural material?

National strategy

National funding programme

Domain specific initiatives

Regional schemes

No specific scheme

Other

Please provide details of the **present** scheme, and any developments **since the last reporting period**.

Major developments in the reference period:

The seven year Images for the Future (Beelden voor de Toekomst) program was completed in December 2014, resulting in the digitisation of 90.000 hours of video, 20.000 hours of film, 100.000 hours of audio and 2.5 Million photo's. The total budget spend was € 121,6 million.

A start was made with the mass-digitisation of the collections from the National Archives (Nationaal Archief), as part of the DTR-program.

The national Metamorfoze programme for preservation through digitisation, coordinated by the National library, continues with a track for printed as well as archival material.

New initiatives were started on the regional level, for example the € 5 M Deltaplan Digitalisering at the Province of Fryslân.

Within the domain of Science, there is not an overall-strategy for the digitization of cultural materials. However, in the Humanities several large government-funded programs and projects are in place to build and maintain research infrastructures aiming to provide access to digitized and digital born texts and objects, in

combination with the development of tools for analysis and visualization (Nederlab, The Language Archive, CLARIN, CLARIAH).

Overall, there has been a decrease in availability of public and private funds for digitisation of cultural heritage collections at the local and regional level, there has been an increase in the use of crowdsourcing projects and platforms to involve user groups in the digitisation of heritage collections, e.g. through the platform Vele Handen.

- Are quantitative targets for the digitisation of cultural material set at national level?

Please provide details for the reference period 2013-2015 including any available figures on digitisation targets and allocated budgets/budget sources.

No overall targets set by the Dutch Government on an national level. The National Library and the National Archives both set new targets.

National Library (strategic plan 2015-2018)

- Digitisation of 90% of all books and the most relevant journals and magazines published in The Netherlands before 1940. The long term strategy aims at digitizing all Dutch printed material by 2030.

- Digitisation of 10% (20,7 km) of the archival collection (207 km) in the period 2014 – 2029. So far 455 metres has been digitised within this programme.

National Archives:

- As part of a dedicated programme on digitization, access and preservation (DTR), started in 2014, a target was set on the digitization of 10% of the national archival collection kept by the National Archives and regional archives in the next 15 years.

- Are qualitative targets for the digitisation of cultural material set at national level?

Please provide details of any **present** standards or guidelines, and any developments **since the last reporting period**.

No changes compared to 2011-2013

b. **Creating overviews of digitised cultural material and contributing to collaborative efforts to establish an overview at European level**

- Is a national scheme or mechanism in place for monitoring the digitisation of cultural material?

Yes [] No [x]

If yes, please provide details.

No specific scheme or mechanism on the National level.

- Has your country encouraged and supported the participation of cultural institutions to the [ENUMERATE](#) surveys for the establishment of a European-level overview of digitisation data? Please provide details of actions **within this reporting period**, any related figures, and/or plans to support contribution in upcoming surveys.

Yes, resulting in a high level of response from Dutch institutions in all three of the ENUMERATE core surveys.

2. PROGRESS ON 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 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?

Yes [] No []

Please provide details of any major partnerships established **since the last reporting period**, compliance of the respective agreements with the conditions in Annex I of the Recommendation as well as contact details of the cultural institution involved.

Libraries: the digitisation of printed material with Proquest and Google continue, with the Google-digitisation now being extended to university libraries, firstly Amsterdam. <http://uba.uva.nl/actueel/overige/over-de-uba/project-digitalisering-met-google---faq.html>

In the project Erfgoed en Locatie (Heritage and Location; budget 3,4 m€) some new public-private partnerships have been established and some existing partnerships have been extended in order to improve the opportunities to present and access location based digital cultural heritage.

The Netherlands operates a joint aggregation infrastructure that brings together millions of metadata records connected to digitised heritage objects. This initiative, called Digitale Collectie, collaborates with five companies offering collection management software. Jointly, the project and the companies invested to connect the collection management software to the aggregation infrastructure. Both parties invested 40k Euro's (each) to develop and deploy this solution.

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

- Is your country using, or planning to use, funding from the European Structural and Investment Funds for the period 2014-2020 for the digitisation of cultural material?

Yes [] No [x]

If yes, please provide details of specific programmes, or large-scale projects, and respective amounts.

4. PROGRESS ON WAYS TO 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 developed ways to optimise the use of digitisation capacity and achieve economies of scale, through pooling of digitisation efforts or cross-border collaboration?

Yes [x] No []

Please provide details of any developments or best practice examples of national, or cross-border, collaboration **within this reporting period**.

Under coordination of the Dutch Government during the reference-period there has been put a lot of effort in creating better conditions for scaling of digitisation activities and cross-domain cooperation in the future: Strengthening cooperation between archives, libraries, museums, audio-visual archives en scientific institutions in a cross-domain Network on Digital heritage (Netwerk Digitaal Erfgoed) and presenting a joint National Digital Heritage Strategy in March 2015.

http://www.den.nl/art/uploads/files/Publicaties/20150608_Nationale_strategie_digitaal_erfgoed_Engels.pdf

Also, the Netherlands and Flanders are harmonising their policies and practices with digital heritage under the umbrella of the Nederlandse Taalunie.

DIGITISATION AND ONLINE ACCESSIBILITY OF PUBLIC DOMAIN MATERIAL

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

a. Ensuring 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? How do cultural institutions in your country take up the Europeana Public Domain Charter? Please provide details of the **present** situation and any developments **within this reporting period**.

-

b. Promoting the 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 and re-use of digitised public domain material? Please provide details of any developments **within this reporting period**.

All the national sectoral institutions, the Dutch Government and other key-players committed themselves to the principles layed down in the National Digital Heritage Strategy (March 2015), in which improving uses and re-use of the digitals collections is one of the main goals.

Open Cultuur Data, which sets ups workshops and hackathons to promote open use of digital cultural heritage (<http://www.opencultuurdata.nl>)

Several museums, archives and libraries are collaborating with the Wikipedia community. For instance by welcoming Wikipedians in residence for a fixed duration of time. An overview of activities can be found here: <https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:GLAM> The impact is substantial:

- Currently (November 2015) 586.000 items from Dutch heritage originations are available on Wikipedia Commons and available to be reused.
- Over the past years, the pages on which the images reside have been viewed 2 billion (!) times.

- What experience has your country been able to gather concerning the re-use of digitised public domain material for non-commercial or commercial purposes? Please provide details of **any best practice examples within this reporting period**. 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).

Rijksstudio (launched in 2014 by the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam), which includes a Rijksstudio Award for the best creative re-use of content from the Rijksstudio.

Expeditie Wikipedia (a project involving various academic collections in the Netherlands).

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

- Are measures to limit the use of watermarks or other visual protection measures reducing the usability of digitised public domain material in place?

Yes [] No [x]

Please provide details of any developments **since the last reporting period**. Where applicable, please also indicate best/worst practice examples.

-

DIGITISATION AND ONLINE ACCESSIBILITY OF IN-COPYRIGHT MATERIAL

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

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

- Has your country adopted legislation to transpose the Directive on orphan works?

Yes [x] No []

Please provide details of any developments **since the last reporting period**.

The Netherlands has implemented the Orphan Works Directive in national legislation on the 8th of October 2014, by creating an extra copyright exception (next to the exceptions that were mentioned in the last report) that allows Cultural Heritage Institutions (publicly accessible libraries, educational establishments, museums as well archives or film or audio heritage institutions) to digitize and display (off line and online) orphan works in their collection in order to achieve aims related to their public-interest missions. These missions

include preservation and accessibility of cultural heritage.

The national Competent Authority for the Orphans Works Database is the Cultural Heritage Agency (Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed, RCE). The RCE started to organize this role within the field of cultural heritage and national networks that include the National Library, the National Archives, the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision and the Eye Film Institute. Additionally, the Cultural Heritage Agency and its partners participate in international networks such as Europeana.

Given that the diligent search per work prescribed by the Directive is unfeasible for large scale digitization the Dutch Government has decided to draft a proposal to introduce Extended Collective Licensing (ECL) in Dutch copyright legislation in 2016. By letter of the 12th of October 2015 the Dutch Government informed the Parliament about this decision.

b. 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 out-of-commerce works?

Yes [x] No []

Please provide details of any developments **since the last reporting period** (including schemes, references and impact).

In 2014 THE BASICS for copyright management was presented. The Basics is a set of guidelines for the production, distribution and use of digital cultural heritage. The guidelines for copyright management set a standard for all Dutch heritage institutions to analyse the copyright status of their collections and to manage the digitisation of these collections accordingly.

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

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

Yes [x] No []

Please provide details of any developments **since the last reporting period**.

No partner in ARROW.

Film Institute EYE has contributed ca 700 orphaned films to the Orphan Works Database.

Europeana Sounds (the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision is one of the

main partners) has published a report on “Requirements for substantially increasing/enabling/improving online access to sound heritage in Europe”.

EUROPEANA

7. PROGRESS ON CONTRIBUTION TO THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEANA

- a. 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
- Please provide details of any developments, or best practice examples, **within this reporting period.**

In 2015 the project Digital Collections in Europeana was finalized, resulting in the delivery of almost 2.5 M records to Europeana (by May 2015), making it the largest national aggregator in Europe. And the second-biggest contributor to Europeana. <http://statistics.europeana.eu/content> In 2013-2014 the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science submitted the funding to connect the digital collections of another extra 59 cultural institutions.

Despite the growing number of connected collections, the knowledge of and active support for Europeana is still limited, notwithstanding an active line of communication, with information, workshops and tools on IP Rights and Datamodels. The further work on the aggregation of records made available in Europeana will be continued as part of the working-program of the National Digital Heritage Strategy.

Specifically for audio-visual objects, three pan-EU projects are running:

- Europeana Sounds (contributing one million audio recordings in Europeana by January 2017) For the Netherlands, Sound and Vision is contributing content.
- EUscreen (contributing one million audio recordings in Europeana by February 2016) For the Netherlands, Sound and Vision is contributing content.
- European Film Gateway (currently offers access to 790.000 objects) for the Netherlands, EYE is contributing.

- Please provide figures concerning the contribution of your country to Europeana with regards to the indicative targets for minimum content contribution by 2015, as set at Annex II of the Recommendation.

Indicative target 2015 (Annex II of the Recommendation): 1,571,000 objects.

Actual figure (Europeana KPI's July 2015) 6,247,890 objects.

- Are there known obstacles that have prevented your country from reaching the indicative targets for 2015? **(if relevant)**

-

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

- Please provide details of any steps taken, or best practice examples, **within this reporting period.**

General public funding for cultural institutions and projects: In general the policy in the Netherlands on making digital cultural collections available and connected, is gradually shifting from being encouraging and supportive to 'comply or explain'. Making content accessible through the national aggregator, domain-aggregators and Europeana isn't conditional for funding, but approached more and more as a matter of course.

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

- Please provide details of any steps taken, or best practice examples, **within this reporting period.**

There already is a substantial availability of masterpieces from The Netherlands through Europeana (e.g. collections from Teylers Museum, Van Gogh Museum, Rijksmuseum). The Netherlands aims to use the Europeana 280 / Arts Channel Project to involve other museums as well.

d. 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, which may bring about economies of scale

- Is a national aggregator bringing content from different domains into Europeana present in your country?

Yes [x] No []

- Please provide details of any developments, **within this reporting period,** concerning national aggregators, participating organisations and content domains covered.

See 7a

- Please provide details of any developments or best practice examples, **within this reporting period**, concerning contribution to cross-border aggregators in specific domain or for specific topics.

DANS contributed archaeological research and heritage data to CARARE, a best practice network which brings together heritage agencies and organisations, archaeological museums and research institutions and specialist digital archives from all over Europe to make digital content for Europe's unique archaeological monuments and historic sites interoperable with Europeana.

The Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision is contributing content through EUscreen, Europeana Sounds and Europeana Fashion.

- e. 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
- Please provide details of any steps taken, or best practice examples, **within this reporting period**, to ensure the use of common digitisation and metadata standards to achieve interoperability at European level.

Through the national aggregator, the Europeana Data Model (EDM) has been widely promoted and is now accepted in the Netherlands as the standard datamodel for cross domain collaboration. As such, EDM is part of the architectural scheme for digital heritage that is currently under preparation.

A topic that has gained more interest in the reporting period is the standardisation of 3D digitisation of cultural heritage. European co-operation is considered vital to achieve this.

Dutch institutions and experts participate in the Europeana Cloud project, which is working towards a cloud-based infrastructure which will:

- Source, prepare and add new data (2.4 million new metadata records and 5 million digital items) to the Cloud infrastructure;
- Allow content providers and aggregators to efficiently store, share and provide access to digital cultural heritage;
- Give researchers new services and tools, with which they can access, work on and share the content stored in the Cloud.
- Enable everyone to feedback enriched data back into the cloud, for use by institutions and researchers alike.

The issue of persistent identifiers is addressed within the NCDD network for

digital durability. Standards and guidelines from Europeana are used as input.

- Please provide details of any developments or best practice examples, within this reporting period, concerning the systematic use of permanent identifiers.

- There are several Dutch Persistent Identifier infrastructures already available to ensure sustainable links to data and metadata
- The URN:NBN infrastructure is used to reference publications and datasets. Especially used by KB and DANS and the repositories of Dutch universities.
- EPIC (Handle System) is used to reference all sorts of digital objects.
- Increasingly Datacite is being used as well within the scientific realm.
- Next to referencing objects, infrastructures are also being used to create opportunities to use identifiers for persons, such as the DAI (Digital Author Identifier). This identifier is being used to identify authors. Internationally collaborations are set up with ISNI and ORCID.

Within the framework of the National strategy for digital heritage, a project has started to develop a service based on the DOI (Digital Object Identifier). Goal is enable esp. smaller cultural heritage organisations to create Persistent Identifiers for object and metadata. The project will in 2016 result in a scalable and sustainable service hosted on a non-profit basis.

f. 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 steps has your country taken to ensure the free availability of existing metadata? How do cultural institutions in your country take up the Europeana Data Exchange Agreement? Please provide details of any developments or best practice examples, **within this reporting period.**

The reporting period has shown some uptake of CC0 as the license for publishing and sharing metadata, albeit at a slow pace. The National Aggregator does not require this license. However, only metadata with this license is channelled to Europeana.

The metadata of academic publication repositories, public research data repositories and current research information systems are freely available, are harvested and aggregated through the NARCIS portal hosted by DANS.

- What experience has your country been able to gather concerning the re-use of free metadata, through services such as Europeana or for innovative applications? Please provide details of **any best practice examples within this reporting period.**

There have been several hackathons and other events in the Netherlands in which the re-use of free metadata has been encouraged and demonstrated. Among the best practices are the Amsterdam Museum and the dataset of national monuments.

- g. 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
- Please provide details of any developments or best practice examples, **within this reporting period**,

-

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? Please provide details of **any developments since the last reporting period**.

In 2014, the National Coalition for Digital Preservation (NCDD) carried out a study into the possibilities for developing a network of nationwide facilities at public organisations for ensuring sustainable access to digital information in the Netherlands. The result of this study is a clear definition and understanding of what an infrastructure for long-term access should be. Besides, a scenario for growth to a network of distributed services has been described. A distinctive feature of this scenario is that institutes retain their own facilities where necessary. Wherever possible, facilities are shared.

This scenario provides for three lines: The development of a network of technical facilities (like storage facilities); Assistance and consultation (this involves services like training, research, persistent identifiers, and certification); Distributed applications for digital preservation.

Next steps, carried out in 2016 within the program Sustainable digital heritage is to set up a list of excising services to be used within the network and develop the non-existing services needed to enhance the network.

- http://ncdd.nl/site/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/summary_NCDD_research_DEFWEB.pdf

Research Data Netherlands is an alliance between 3TU.Datacentrum, Data Archiving and Networked Services (DANS) and SURFsara. With this coalition, which is also open to other parties, the three data archives join forces in the area of long-term data archiving. The collaborating organizations work together on implementing strategies for long-term preservation of research data. They are well-embedded and involved in international data organizations (such as the RDA) and data-archiving projects (such as EUDAT).

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? Please provide details of **any developments since the last reporting period.**

- The Netherlands has implemented the Orphan Works Directive in national Legislation on the 8th of October 2014 by introducing an extra copyright exception (in addition to the exceptions that were mentioned in the last report) so that Cultural Heritage Institutions (publicly accessible libraries, educational establishments, museums as well archives or film or audio heritage institutions) are allowed to digitize orphan works in their collection in order to achieve aims related to their public-interest missions. These missions include preservation and making accessible of cultural heritage.
- A work shall be considered an orphan work if none of the right holders in that work is identified or, even if one or more of them is identified, none is located despite a diligent search for the right holders having been carried out and recorded. A diligent search means consulting the appropriate sources for the category of works and other protected subject-matter in question.
- The appropriate sources are determined in a list that that was created in consultation with right holders and users, and that includes the relevant sources listed in the Annex of the Orphan Works Directive.
- Given that the diligent search per work prescribed by the Directive is unfeasible for large scale digitization the Dutch Government has decided to draft a proposal to introduce Extended Collective Licensing (ECL) in Dutch copyright legislation in 2016. By a letter of the 12th of October 2015 the Dutch Government informed the Parliament about this decision.

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.

- a. 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? Please provide details of **any developments since the last reporting period.**

The Dutch funding organisation for research NWO, the academy (KNAW), and the universities have developed (in some cases: are developing) research data management policies, which include policies with respect to long-term preservation of research data. At various levels, both institutional and national as well as international, infrastructures are in place or under development for the long-term archiving of such research data. One example of such an infrastructure is DataverseNL, in which most Dutch universities (i.c. The University Libraries) work together with DANS for an efficient system of digital preservation of research data.

- b. 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? Please provide details of **any developments since the last reporting period.**

-

- c. 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 of **any developments since the last reporting period.**

The National library preserves a selection of Dutch websites: at this time 7600 websites are preserved, 16 TB of data. There is no legal deposit legislation for this activity. NL uses the opt-out method after asking permission from the website owner by letter.

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 of **any developments since the last reporting period**.

No real initiatives to harmonise deposit arrangement have been taken place. However, discussions and pilot projects were carried out in order to get more insight in the problems within the different domains (archives, libraries, museums, science). This resulted in sharing preservation policies amongst each other as a first step towards deposit arrangements to be made in the near future. Exchange of experiences and specific policies led to a better understanding of processes and issues regarding the ingest of digital materials in The Netherlands.

The Netherlands has been a driving force behind the Unesco initiative PERSIST, in which global guidelines for the collection and preservation of born digital cultural heritage are being created.

In the research sector there is an extensive interchange with other member states, both in the context of a variety of international organizations and committees (eg. Science Europe) and in disciplinary organised research infrastructures (eg. CESSDA, CLARIN, DARIAH).

IS THE RECOMMENDATION UP TO DATE AND FIT FOR PURPOSE?

THE RECOMMENDATION IS A NON-BINDING EU LEGAL ACT WHOSE PURPOSE IS TO COORDINATE, SUPPLEMENT AND SUPPORT MS' ACTIONS IN AN AREA WHERE THE EU HAS NO CENTRAL COMPETENCE. IN THIS CONTEXT:

- What are your views on the overall usefulness of the Recommendation as an instrument to improve conditions, in the areas addressed therein, in your country?

The Recommendation and the actions on the European level resulting from it have been useful to speed up and connect policies and initiatives in the areas addressed.

The progress reports on the Recommendation have been useful to generate overview on the state of the art in European countries (including our own) and have been used as a source of information at the national level. The MSEG network and meetings (closely related to the Recommendations) have been of use to several European projects (contacts, input, reflection), for example ENUMERATE.

- Which provisions of the Recommendation do you consider to have had high impact in your country?

In general: The activity of Memory Institutions and the support from (National) government were already on a relatively high level at the time the Recommendations were decided on. So the Recommendations were supportive to (existing) policies and projects. However, the EU Recommendations were useful because the activities in The Netherlands gained momentum and were embedded in an European approach.

Provisions that have presumably had the highest impact:

1. Planning and monitoring of the digitisation of cultural material (as it led to the initiative and funding of the national aggregator Digitale Collectie).
4. Optimising digitisation capacity and achieving economies of scale (as it gave an impulse to digitisation projects and policies all over the Union and thus enlarged possibilities to create partnerships, consortia and re-use).
6. Improving conditions for digitisation and online accessibility of in copyright material (as it helped – by means of Europeana and other platforms - to promote the use of Creative Commons / IPR Frameworks).
7. Contribute to the further development of Europeana

- Which provisions of the Recommendation do you consider to have had low impact in your country?

2. Public-private partnerships (as the Recommendation in general have little impact on the priorities of private partners and the main memory institutions already had an open mind towards public-private partnerships)

3. Make use of EU's Structural Funds

8./9./10. Digital preservation (as the initiatives regarding digital preservation in the netherlands were merely pushed and inspired through other international projects and networks).

- Would the Recommendation benefit from an update to enhance its impact or bring it up to date with current challenges so that it remains relevant in the coming years? Please provide your suggestions or comments with respect to specific provisions or in general.

Yes, the Recommendation would benefit from an update and then could focus more on quality of content and metadata, IPR, cross-domain cooperation, involving users and re-users and sustainability and promotion of the common service infrastructures.

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.