



## Europeana Foundation Governing Board Meeting

30 March 2016  
10h00 – 17h00 CET  
Paris, BnF  
Quai François-Mauriac  
75706 Paris Cedex 13

### **Comments on 9 March Council Conclusions**

*Action proposed: For information and discussion*

#### **Circulation:**

Europeana Foundation Governing Board Members & Observers

#### **Classification:**

Public



## Comments on 9 March Council Conclusions –

The following comments and thoughts are made by the Europeana Network Association and Europeana Foundation. Suggested changes to the articles themselves are marked in red

General remark about Articles 1-3: these articles could do more justice to the role of digital cultural heritage in society and all the investments of Member States, Cultural Heritage Institutions and the European Commission over the past two decades

Article 1. Digital technologies not only affect long term preservation of and access to CH collections, they also have a big impact on the composition of the collections, with the addition of born digital cultural products

Article 2: online availability does much more than enhancing visibility: it offers entirely new ways of interacting with cultural and historical items

Article 3: DH is not only valuable, it is essential for digital humanities, a whole new field of research

Article 3: the possibility to create of new products might benefit from a separate article rather than being an add on to research and education

Article 7: Europeana is more than a platform joining markets it relies on a very large and growing network of cultural heritage professionals from experts in the semantic web and multilingualism to curators, editors and domain specialists. We think this should be reflected and suggest the following change:

**In its current form, Europeana is a multi-sided internet platform and  
an inclusive network of cultural heritage professionals**

Also within Article 7 we feel that Europeana collections is already creating value for end users, while acknowledging that this will always be a work in progress: **It aims to create value for end-users (Europeana Collections):**

Article 9: Digitisation is one of the preconditions as well as an investment .

**digitisation of cultural heritage by Member States is an investment and a precondition in providing online access to European cultural heritage;**

An addition to this section might be another precondition that **Europeana nurtures a thriving innovation ecosystem that addresses technical challenges. for instance R&D on multilingual access and digital durability.**

Article 13. Please reference [Europeana Licensing Framework](#), [Public Domain Charter](#), [Public Domain Usage Guidelines](#) and [Rights Labelling Campaign](#) as Europeana has been the key driver in this area to bring about a mental shift in the CH institutions

Article 16 Reference [Europeana Publishing Framework](#)

Article 17 – nice to use full name Europeana 1914-1918 and Europeana 1989 – this is the brand...

### **RECOGNISING THAT THE FOLLOWING CHALLENGES LIE AHEAD FOR EUROPEANA.**

We feel that there are many more challenges that lie ahead for the acquisition, management and exploitation of digital cultural heritage collections. Europeana should not presented as a problem, but as a solution. Perhaps adding the challenges faced by the Member States would be fair?.

Article 19 – This article is quite operational, and maybenot strategic enough to fit into Council Conclusions?

**must become more attractive and user-friendly, in particular by improving the presentation of the content, enhancing access to collections and further developing multilingual search functionalities in line with best available practices;9**

30% increase in traffic and 20,000 downloads within first 2 weeks of launching Europeana Collections.... mid December – this goal has been partially achieved.... Could we rephrase to **“must continue to improve its efforts towards being user friendly, in particular..... etc”**

Article 20 **thematic and curated showcasing, with the further active involvement of cultural heritage institutions from Member States**, as this already happens via the set up of Europeana Music from the Europeana Sounds

consortium and the development of Europeana Art History with the Member States direct involvement. Also presented is quite static we are aiming for interaction and participation now.

**continued and increased efforts on the sharing of content through**

**social media and commonly used apps, websites and major internet**

**cultural and educational projects led by third parties and**

**international organisations such as UNESCO's Memory of the World**

**Register,**

Interesting to know what this means – it doesn't really fit here. Sharing the material via the World Register is a massive Curation task, making institutions aware that they could tag their content so that it can be machined shared makes sense. Suggest the example of being involved with UNESCO be shifted to a footnote also because Unesco uses the MoW Register in the World Digital Library website; <https://www.wdl.org/en/>

We suggest the addition of the more general idea of increasing participation

**more engagement and participation with the content including via tools for end-users to list personal favourites, share discoveries on social media, and upload personal memorabilia within specific projects,**

We suggest addition of a qualifying sentence as this does already happen with iTunesU, GoogleFieldTrip, Clarin, European Schoolnet, API's etc **Continue, with Cultural Heritage Institutions, to demonstrate concrete examples of re-use in other sectors, in particular research, education, creative industries and tourism, and show the fundamental role available cultural heritage plays in the growth of the Creative Industries**

suggesting this last sentence addition because we need to make this connection more apparent at political levels. Creative Industries rely on the fuel of the Cultural Heritage Institutions but do not contribute to the costs of creating the material in the first place. This needs to be mind shift in governments. CH cannot both produce the material and making it freely available for others to grow at the same time as being expected to heavily supplement their activities by selling digital cultural heritage

Article 21: **“in full compliance with copyright and related rights”**. Could this be rephrased as: **“ taking into account the current limitations of copyright and related rights”** ?

Article 23: this business model for Europeana is not only “unlikely”, the cultural heritage institutions will not allow Europeana to sell their (meta)data. So this model is impossible to implement without destroying the foundation on which Europeana is built, the good relationships with CH institutions.

Article 25: this article doesn't really phrase the challenge. The fact that 20th century material is underrepresented is not the cause but the result of another problem; the challenge lies with the copyright, not with the fact that it is underrepresented.

Article 26: Also mention the work by the Commission on Orphan works here?

Article 29: This was debated for the recently changed governance of Europeana (mid 2015) where we tried to reduced the Board size to 17, create a democratic base with the inclusion of elected members of the Europeana Network Association and keep the knowledge and history of the Cultural Heritage institutions through their professional associations and make room for an entrepreneur and professionals from education and research. For MS we agreed via the MSEG

that the best solution was the sitting presidency as the voting member with the pre and post presidencies being observers. The Foundation would be open to other good suggestions but ask that the balance of the Board be born in mind in any Council Conclusion recommendations.

INVITES THE EUROPEANA FOUNDATION AND THE

EUROPEANA NETWORK ASSOCIATION TO: how does this work if

procurement, in and of itself, allows for another body to submit and win the procurement. We know of at least 2 Italian companies who will submit, how does the procurement safeguard for lack of knowledge or background, or connections to the Europeana Network for instance?

Article 33 – See Europeana paper on core versus generic services

We miss a paragraph in this section with a call to the Commission that stresses the urgency to renew copyright laws and make them more fit for the digital age.

Also refer to the implementation of the orphan works directive here? Or perhaps make the article more generic, also leaving out the reference to ECL? Not sure if ECL should be mentioned so prominently as according to some Danish professionals there are several negative side effects, making ECL much more expensive than originally planned.