



LIGUE DES BIBLIOTHÈQUES EUROPÉENNES DE RECHERCHE
ASSOCIATION OF EUROPEAN RESEARCH LIBRARIES



LIBER-EBLIDA Digitisation Workshop, October 2009 The LIBER Digitisation Road Map

On 19–21 October 2009, the 2nd LIBER-EBLIDA Digitisation Workshop took place in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek in The Hague.

In the course of the three days, 125 attenders listened to a wide variety of presentations and discussions (including feedback on Twitter at #LIBER). The meeting reached a number of conclusions and LIBER and EBLIDA have consequently drawn up a second version of their Road Map for the Digitisation community in Europe, and for the European Commission, on how to progress digitisation activity in Europe.

The Recommendations given below both update and replace the first version of the LIBER Digitisation Road Map, issued after the 1st Digitisation Workshop in 2007.

LIBER and EBLIDA are convinced that concerted action on digitisation in Europe is still required to support European researchers, students and citizens to gain access to Europe's scholarly and cultural heritage.

LIBER and EBLIDA are happy to work with the European Commission, Europeana and other bodies to help realize this challenging vision.

1. Vision for European Digitisation Activity

1. LIBER and EBLIDA look forward to the positive effects of Europeana in improving the current situation concerning digitisation of content, which currently reveals no agreement, scope or real co-ordination for digitisation activity across Europe.
2. Co-ordination is not simply a European issue. European cultural objects are held in libraries, museums, galleries and archives all over the world. It is important that Europe is able to come to a view on what and where relevant digitisation activity should take place.
3. Digitisation is not simply an add-on to what a Library currently does. Digitisation has the ability to transform the experience of the user who will use materials from Europe's cultural institutions. This in turn will help to define the meaning of European citizenship.
4. Responsibility for overseeing this transformation is shared between the European institutions and the Member States.
5. LIBER and EBLIDA are happy to work with the European Commission and other partners to achieve this consensus.

6. LIBER and EBLIDA Library Directors should take a lead to encourage and support change, innovation and risk taking in digitisation activity.

2. Content

7. There is a need for formal selection criteria for the identification of material to be digitised, as this would aid co-ordination across European countries.
8. Should Open Access portals such as Europeana provide access to licensed content?
9. What is the role of portals, such as Europeana, in providing access to new sources of material, such as datasets of primary data?
10. There is a corresponding need to understand who the user is and why he/she wishes to use digitised content. Such knowledge will help with issues such as the design of user interfaces, information retrieval and the design of tools to support the user in their work.
11. The construction of a critical mass of digitised content needs to be achieved sooner rather than later, and a programme should be constructed identifying how this will be accomplished.
12. It is important that the wishes of the user are part of any decision making process and steps need to be taken to identify what the European citizen actually wants in terms of digitised content.
13. The community needs models of Good Practice for cross-domain activity.
14. The European digitisation community needs structures which can speak with authority about cross-domain issues, to co-ordinate activity.

3. Discovery and Presentation

15. Funding is needed to allow for more conversion of non-automated metadata for library/archive materials. Catalogues which remain in analogue form effectively obstruct access to the material they represent. Libraries need to assess their priorities in this area, seeking partnership funding where appropriate to help them.
16. Europeana should become the 'European resource space' uniting access to a wide variety of digital objects from cultural and educational sectors across Europe.
17. The scope of Europeana needs to be expanded beyond national libraries, to embrace major academic research libraries and other important library collections. LIBER can help play an important role here in brokering partnerships and in contributing metadata for content.
18. In the European digitisation environment, browsing is more important than searching.

19. More encouragement is needed to bring the work of archives, museums, galleries and libraries closer together.
20. There needs to be a high-level catalogue of the records of digitised content. This would provide awareness of what is happening in European digitisation activity. Some of the building blocks are in place and services such as Europeana and WorldCat are aiming to provide comprehensive coverage in this area. Libraries need to be encouraged to create local records of digitised materials, for harvesting by services such as WorldCat and Europeana.
21. This high-level catalogue needs to be de-duplicated, and also FRBR'ized to bring together related copies of the same work.
22. There is a need to develop an Open Source Reader for content and for that Reader to be available in the public domain.
23. There is a need to identify minimum standards of interoperability. Suggested standards are:
 - Data: SC (Dublin Core), XML, UTF-8
 - Transfer: OAI-PMH
 - Portal Standard: JSR 268
24. Where aggregation takes place, the relationship between the aggregators needs to be both defined and sustainable.
25. There is a need to work on synchronisation issues concerning aggregation. Aggregation of metadata records is a 2-way process and enriched records should be able to be written back from the aggregation service to the contributing library/institution.

4. Copyright and Intellectual Property Rights

26. Despite evident resistance to re-open the question, it is clear from discrepancies in the application of the Information Society (Copyright) Directive in different Member States that the Directive is far from satisfactory. We recommend that the Commission looks carefully at the November 2006 report it commissioned, *The recasting of copyright and related rights for the knowledge economy*, as a prelude to revising the Directive.
27. There should be a uniform copyright regime all over Europe, on a level that restores the balance of interests and builds on the Information Society Directive.
28. Some Member States have provided that contracts may not override the statute law of copyright. This provision is in accordance with Article 15 of the Database Directive and therefore should be part of the *acquis communautaire*. It is essential in order to preserve (in line with recitals 14 and 34 of the Information Society Directive) an encouragement for creative, educational and scientific uses which do not harm the rights-holder. We believe that this is an important clarification that could be brought to the copyright regime in the Community.

29. For older material, the Commission should encourage the adoption of a pragmatic solution by identifying a date (say a moving wall of 50 years from the date of publication) before which it is acceptable to digitise without formality, provided that any emerging legitimate rights-holder receives compensation.

5. Standards and Policies: Metadata, Interoperability

30. Registries/persistent identifiers need to be established/adopted as a building block of the infrastructure of a digitised Europe. There are models of good practice in Europe and these should be used as the starting point for pan-European activity in this area:

- URN (Uniform Resource Name)
- DOI (Digital Object Identifier)
- ARK (Archival Resource Key)
- PURL (Persistent Uniform Resource Locator)

31. Guidelines are required to support selection and use of the full spectrum of metadata, based around Dublin Core; minimum standards need to be defined; although it should be noted that retrieval of content is both by assigned metadata and also by the indexing of the full-text.

32. There is a need for Best Practice toolkits, covering:

- Mapping
- Export
- Protocols

33. Libraries should support the development of designated EC Centres of Competencies. Such Centres can provide guidance in:

- Dissemination
- Support issues
- Training
- Co-ordination at a European level

34. Where the provision of rich metadata may not be possible, digitisation projects and services should consider crowdsourcing / social tagging – for here the relationship with the user is 2-way

6. The User

35. To deliver successful digitisation projects, it is important to know more about the user and their needs. Will users search via portals or from their own user spaces such as Flickr, Facebook, Wikipedia, Google?

36. It is important to note that libraries are 'of the web' as well as 'on the web'.

37. Users still require multiple routes to resources.

38. The EU should create incentives for users to appraise digital collections and services, thus providing:
- Critical analysis from the end user not the librarian
 - Educative and business insights, which would help inform the economic case
 - Generation of Use Cases
39. EU-funded digitisation bids require a demonstration of the understanding of user needs and an ability to measure impact
40. Europeana should develop a PR and pan-European educational programme to educate users in the benefits of using the Europeana portal.
41. It is important to know what the benefits of cross-domain working (e.g. libraries-museums-archives-galleries) for the user are.

7. Standards & Policies: Business Models

42. The European Commission does not currently fund the creation of digitised content, but it should re-consider this position.
43. The Commission recommends the formation of Public/Private partnerships but Public/Private partnerships require funding in order for public institutions to make an offering.
44. Working with private partners is helpful since such partnerships act as a catalyst for significant achievement and help to provide infrastructure and to identify a market. The terms of a Public/Private partnership should be negotiated in advance of work being started.
45. It is not the case that Member States, or individual National and University Libraries, have funding in their operational budgets to progress the large scale digitisation of content. In this respect, European funding is important to progress this activity.
46. Private funding for digitisation activity may restrict access by the user, which is not in the interests of the European citizen. LIBER and EBLIDA do not see this as the preferred route for funding the digitisation of content.
47. The High Level Report on [Public Private Partnerships](#) should be taken into account when forming such Public/Private partnerships.

8. Permanent Access

48. Activities across Europe – e.g. e-Depot (Netherlands), EU projects such as PLANETS, and the LIBER-supported [LIFE](#) project for costing digital curation activities – should form the basis of a more co-ordinated approach to digital curation. This includes the work of

the NSF-funded [Blue Ribbon](#) Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access, on which LIBER is represented.

49. LIBER is happy to contribute to a dialogue in Europe on how joined-up thinking on the permanent access to academic and cultural content for the European user can be achieved.

50. What is the future model for European digital curation services? There needs to be a programme to help identify the way forward. Trust is a key issue in this journey.

The Organisations' making this Road Map

LIBER is the principal association of the major research libraries of Europe. See <http://www.libereurope.eu>; EBLIDA is the European Bureau of Library, Information and Documentation Associations. See <http://www.eblida.org>.

31 October 2009