

# **‘PRESERVING DIGITAL MEMORY IN THE COMMUNITY CONTEXT’**

WORKSHOP  
ICCU, ROME, 4 FEBRUARY 2005

## **INDEX**

<a href="#"><u>Programme</u></a>	2
<a href="#"><u>List of Participants</u></a>	3
<a href="#"><u>Brief Summary</u></a>	5
<a href="#"><u>Minutes</u></a>	6
<a href="#"><u>Breakout Groups Report</u></a>	
<a href="#"><u>Coordination</u></a>	10
<a href="#"><u>Research</u></a>	11
<a href="#"><u>Commercial</u></a>	13
<a href="#"><u>Evaluation of the Questionnaires</u></a>	15

# PROGRAMME

Registration, 9 am

Welcome

Dr Marco Paoli, Director of ICCU

Dr Maurizio Fallace, Director General for Archives (IT)

Opening remarks:

Dr Luciano Scala, Director General for Book Heritage and Cultural Institutes (IT)

Core presentation:

Prof Seamus Ross and Prof Maria Guercio: *Proposals for Digital Preservation: Network in the EU: Strategies and Objectives*

Technical remarks:

Dr Maurizio Lunghi, *The 5th call of IST FP6*

Participants are invited to contribute presentations on ongoing national initiatives.

Open discussion

h 11 Coffee break

h13 Lunch (provided)

h14: Open discussion and/or working groups

h 16: Conclusions

The workshop will take place at ICCU, Viale Castro Pretorio 105, IV Floor, Room 434. Simultaneous translation (Italian/English, English/Italian) will be provided.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Seamus Ross (Director of HATII - ERPANET) [s.ross@hatii.arts.gla.ac.uk](mailto:s.ross@hatii.arts.gla.ac.uk)
2. Mariella Guercio (Univ. of Urbino - ERPANET) [m.guercio@mcLink.it](mailto:m.guercio@mcLink.it)
3. Luciano Scala (Direzione Generale per i beni librari- Italy) [scala@librari.beniculturali.it](mailto:scala@librari.beniculturali.it)
4. Maurizio Fallace (Direzione Generale per gli archivi- Italy) [mfallace@archivi.beniculturali.it](mailto:mfallace@archivi.beniculturali.it)
5. Marco Paoli (Direttore di Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico ICCU - Italy) [m.paoli@iccu.sbn.it](mailto:m.paoli@iccu.sbn.it)
6. Vittoria Tola (Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico ICCU - Italy) [v.tola@iccu.sbn.it](mailto:v.tola@iccu.sbn.it)
7. Cristina Magliano (Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico ICCU - Italy) [c.magliano@iccu.sbn.it](mailto:c.magliano@iccu.sbn.it)
8. Maurizio Lunghi (ICCU - Italy) [m.lunghi@culturalheritage.it](mailto:m.lunghi@culturalheritage.it)
9. Annamaria Tammaro (Univ. of Parma - Italy) [tamann65@ipruniv.cce.unipr.it](mailto:tamann65@ipruniv.cce.unipr.it)
10. Cecilia Castellani (University of Urbino – Italy) [c.castellani@iccu.sbn.it](mailto:c.castellani@iccu.sbn.it)
11. Paolo Buonora (State Archives - Italy) [buonora@asrm.archivi.beniculturali.it](mailto:buonora@asrm.archivi.beniculturali.it)
12. Maurizio Messina (Biblioteca Marciana di Venezia - Italy) [messina@marciana.venezia.sbn.it](mailto:messina@marciana.venezia.sbn.it)
13. Pier Luigi Felicciati (Direzione Generale Archivi – Roma, Italy) [pfelicciati@archivi.beniculturali.it](mailto:pfelicciati@archivi.beniculturali.it)
14. Garofalo (Direzione Generale Archivi – Roma, Italy) [lgarofalo@archivi.beniculturali.it](mailto:lgarofalo@archivi.beniculturali.it)
15. Giancarlo Buzzanca (Istituto Centrale per il Restauro – Roma, Italy) [giancarlo@buzzanca.net](mailto:giancarlo@buzzanca.net)
16. Daniel Teruggi (PRESTOSPACE coordinator, INA – France) [dteruggi@ina.fr](mailto:dteruggi@ina.fr)
17. Remigijus Juodelis (National Library - Lithuania) [rejode@lnb.lt](mailto:rejode@lnb.lt)
18. Maria Sliwinska (Director of the International Center for Information Management Systems and Services ICIMSS NRG – Poland) [maria.sliwinska@icimss.edu.pl](mailto:maria.sliwinska@icimss.edu.pl)
19. Marek Jagodzinski (Director of Concept, Torun – Poland) [marek@internet.torun.pl](mailto:marek@internet.torun.pl)
20. Henrik Jarl Hansen (National Cultural Heritage Agency - Ministry of Culture - Denmark) [HJH@kuas.dk](mailto:HJH@kuas.dk)
21. Max Kaiser (Austrian National Library - Austria) [max.kaiser@onb.ac.at](mailto:max.kaiser@onb.ac.at)
22. Richard Boulderstone (British Library - UK) [Richard.Boulderstone@bl.uk](mailto:Richard.Boulderstone@bl.uk)
23. Aziz Abid (UNESCO) [a.abid@unesco.org](mailto:a.abid@unesco.org)
24. Hans Hofman (National Archive of the Netherlands - ERPANET) [hans.hofman@nationaalarchief.nl](mailto:hans.hofman@nationaalarchief.nl)
25. Heike Neuroth (NESTOR Project, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen – Germany) [neuroth@mail.sub.uni-goettingen.de](mailto:neuroth@mail.sub.uni-goettingen.de)
26. Stefan Rohde-Enslin (NESTOR Project, Institut für Museumskunde – Berlin, Germany) [s.rohde-enslin@smb.spk-berlin.de](mailto:s.rohde-enslin@smb.spk-berlin.de)
27. Jörn Sieglerschmidt (BSZ - Bibliotheks-Service-Zentrum, Konstanz - Germany, representing EUBAM) [josi@phil.uni-mannheim.de](mailto:josi@phil.uni-mannheim.de)
28. Birte Christensen-Dalsgaard (State and University Library, Univ. Aarhus - Denmark) [bcd@statsbiblioteket.dk](mailto:bcd@statsbiblioteket.dk)
29. Caffo Rossella (Ministero dei Beni Culturali, MINERVA – Italy) [rcaffo@beniculturali.it](mailto:rcaffo@beniculturali.it)
30. Francesco Saverio Nucci (BRICKS coordinator, Engineering - Italy) [francesco.nucci@eng.it](mailto:francesco.nucci@eng.it)
31. Silvia Boi (BRICKS project, Consorzio Pisa Ricerche - Italy) [s.boi@metaware.it](mailto:s.boi@metaware.it)
32. Pierre Sammut (Manager Corporate Services - Heritage Malta) [pierre.sammut@gov.mt](mailto:pierre.sammut@gov.mt)
33. Hilde van Wijngaarden (Koninklijke Bibliotheek – The Netherlands) [Hilde.vanWijngaarden@kb.nl](mailto:Hilde.vanWijngaarden@kb.nl)
34. Goran Kristiansson (The Regional Archives in Lund - Sweden) [goran.kristiansson@landsarkivet-lund.ra.se](mailto:goran.kristiansson@landsarkivet-lund.ra.se)
35. Maria Carla Cavagnis Sotgiu (Director of Osservatorio programmi internazionali - Italy) [sotgiu@librari.beniculturali.it](mailto:sotgiu@librari.beniculturali.it)

36. Giuliana De Francesco (Ministero dei Beni Culturali MINERVA – Italy)  
[defrancesco@beniculturali.it](mailto:defrancesco@beniculturali.it)
37. Marzia Piccininno (Ministero dei Beni Culturali MINERVA – Italy)  
[minerva@beniculturali.it](mailto:minerva@beniculturali.it)
38. Marco Rufino (Fondazione Rinascimento Digitale – Italy) [marco.rufino@entecarifiirenze.it](mailto:marco.rufino@entecarifiirenze.it)
39. Eva Gilmore (ICCU – Italy) [e.gilmore@iccu.sbn.it](mailto:e.gilmore@iccu.sbn.it)
40. Giovanna Megli (Biblioteca nazionale centrale di Firenze – Italy)  
[gianna.megli@bncf.firenze.sbn.it](mailto:gianna.megli@bncf.firenze.sbn.it)

## BRIEF SUMMARY

### Introduction

This European workshop was organized by the ICCU (Istituto centrale per il catalogo unico delle biblioteche italiane) in the context of the Firenze Agenda follow-up. It was aimed at evaluating, within a qualified group of European experts representing institutions and/or national networks working on digital preservation, what are the real and practical options – best strategy and timing, identification of core topics, priorities and responsibilities - for building up of a **European initiative on digital preservation**, which may take the form of a **coordination action** within the **5th call of IST FP6** (about to be issued).

### Venue and Promoters

The workshop was held in Rome at ICCU, and saw the participation of about forty experts. It was chaired by Seamus Ross (University of Glasgow). The participation of the Director General on Archives, Maurizio Fallace, and of the Director General for Book Heritage and Cultural Institutes, Luciano Scala, proved once again that Italy is fully interested in further developing a European dp strategy. Their contribution to the debate was everything but a matter of form.

### Aims and Objectives

One of the major aims of this workshop was to exchange opinions and information around the idea of a future coordination action for the preservation of digital memory in Europe. It was also the first meeting of the Firenze Agenda experts group, and provided the occasion for evaluating the state-of-the-art of the many projects and actions that have been undertaken by each country and within the different cultural heritage sectors. In terms of more specific objectives, the first one was to draw as precise a picture as possible of the various levels of coordination that must be guaranteed when carrying out a European coordination action, with an eye to the specific problems we may encounter when developing this type of action within the complex domain of digital preservation. The second objective was to identify possible topics and levels of research actions, recognising that research in itself has to be at the centre of any European initiative on digital preservation. The third objective was to propose strategies for fostering commercial participation within this European project.

### Brief Summary of the Debate

The workshop was opened with a few words of welcome by the Director of ICCU, Dr Marco Paoli, followed by the Director General for Archives, Maurizio Fallace, and the Director General for Book Heritage and Cultural Institutes, Luciano Scala, who talked about the Italian efforts to ensure the preservation of digital memory, explaining what role Italy could play in the future at both national and European level.

Maria Guercio (University of Urbino) delivered the core presentation: *Towards a European network for digital preservation. Ideas for a proposal*. She was followed by Maurizio Lunghi, who spoke of the 5<sup>th</sup> Call of IST FP6.

With Seamus Ross as a coordinator, a number of participants took then part to the discussion, commenting the presentation and illustrating the preservation activities ongoing in their countries at national or sectorial level. After the plenary discussion, three break out groups were created: coordination action; research, commercial and industrial engagement. In the course of the final plenary session, Maria Guercio, Daniel Teruggi and Richard Boulderstone respectively reported on the debate and conclusions of each group.

A general discussion then followed on the practical perspective of a European network for a coordination action on digital preservation at EU level. The workshop was closed by Prof Ross. An evaluation questionnaire was distributed to all participants, and 32 of them answered it. The answers were later examined by Prof Ross, and the results expressed a very positive evaluation of the workshop.

## MINUTES OF THE WORKSHOP

The workshop was opened by the Director of ICCU, MARCO PAOLI, who remarked the relevance of the event because of the presence of many national and European experts in the area of digital preservation. The workshop also gave ICCU the chance to present the printed version of the *Proceedings of the International Conference on the Future of Digital Memory and Cultural Heritage* (Florence, 16-17 October 2003), that is the first of a series on digital preservation (dp) within the publishing activity of the ICCU in this field.

The Director General for Archives, MAURIZIO FALLACE, greeted the audience also on behalf of Prof Salvatore Italia, Head of the Italian Department for Archives and Libraries. He informed participants of the recent creation of the Istituto centrale per gli archivi (ICAR), and insisted on the need to invest in safe digital environments and trusted digital repositories.

In the vision of LUCIANO SCALA, Director General for Book Heritage and Cultural Institutes, this workshop is part of a process which started, at both Italian and European level, with the Council Resolution of June 2002. He also stressed that the workshop was not organised by a single Directorate, but by the Department for Archives and Libraries as a whole – something which, according to Scala, proves once again that Italy is fully willing to face the issue of digital preservation and is convinced of the need for a coordinated and well-structured action at national, European and international level. He concluded by inviting participants to express their opinions on the creation of a dp permanent European network.

SEAMUS ROSS (who coordinated the event together with Maria Guercio), after reminding participants that the major objective for the day was to decide how a European digital preservation network could be built, made a first remark on past evolutions, noting how the last decade has not been characterized by an effective improvement of the research results, mainly for the lack of an efficient network and the absence of a coordination process. Only in the last years projects as Erpanet and Delos, and national networks as Nestor and the DPC, have done a lot to catalyze activities on local levels, but research groups are still far from producing as teams. On the other hand, even if the need for a European network in this sector is clearly understood at many institutional levels, it should be clear that obtaining the funds for this kind of project and ensuring its successful and practical implementation is something highly challenging.

After a brief explanation of the agenda for the day, MARIELLA GUERCIO presented the objectives of the workshop (the slides of her presentation are annexed to this report). She focused on two aspects: firstly, she briefly explained what has been done, as a community, in the last four years; secondly, she summed up some ideas for a Coordination Action (CA), expressing the hope that the workshop would help having clearer and more practical ideas on a project which is extremely ambitious, yet unavoidable. The inadequacy of experience collected in only a few decades makes the task of preservers very difficult, within a research environment which cannot ensure – for the moment – a sufficient level of continuity. The speaker then moved to summing up the main results achieved at political level in these years: the Brussels Report on Preserving Tomorrow's Memory (2002), the Council Resolution on Preserving Tomorrow's Memory (June 2002), and the Firenze Agenda of October 2003. And she spoke of the continuing action of EU Presidencies in the field.

She then noted that, given the complexity of the matter, the focus should be on what is really relevant at a level of research and best practices, that is the development of a well defined theoretical framework and the existence of an efficient tool to share best practices. For what concerns research, Mariella Guercio reminded participants that a CA cannot provide tools and funds for research programs, and hence research needs and results should be seen as the basis upon which the action is built (with a particular attention to crucial topics as metadata, digital repositories, etc.). Of course possible activities are seminars and training programmes, technology watch activities, developing, discussing and comparing common research agendas, etc.. She concluded by inviting all participants to seriously discuss of the risks of the project and of the need to establish its boundaries and identify

the possible roles and responsibilities, also for what concerns the definition of a leadership, the transparency of the decision-making process and the reliability of the communication process.

MAURIZIO LUNGHU (Workgroup Firenze Agenda, ICCU) talked about the 5th call of the IST FP6. He said that the call will be issued by the end of May and its deadline should be the 22<sup>nd</sup> of September, and explained that since the first call of FP6 failed to fund dp projects, the next call will be likely focused on this issue. He also said that the Commission expects to receive some IPs or STREPS on specific issues, but is also expecting to receive a CA.. And he insisted on the fact that a coordination action is a specific and quite small kind of project, and that the Commission would not fund research in itself, but only the additional costs of exchanging experiences and cooperating at European level.

In his role of coordinator, Ross then invited participants to present the activities ongoing in their countries at national or sectorial level. Ten participants asked to speak.

HILDE VAN WIJNGAARDEN (Koninklijke Bibliotheek - The Netherlands) appreciated very much the fact that a meeting to discuss about the coordination action was organised. She informed the group about the results of the conference on permanent access to the records of science organised on the 1<sup>st</sup> of last November, under the Dutch Presidency, by the National Library of The Netherlands. She spoke of the recommendations produced by the conference, and in particular of the need to set up a task force for creating a European dp infrastructure, with the participation of all scientific institutes (the National Library will be in charge for its creation, and the British Library is also involved). This task force will be proposed under the Seventh Framework of next year.

ABDELAZIZ ABID (UNESCO) stressed the importance of an overall international dimension for digital preservation, that should be considered a universal responsibility.

STEFAN RHODE-ENSLIN (NESTOR Project, Institut für Museumskunde - Berlin) presented the NESTOR initiative, the German dp network, whose ultimate goal is that of becoming a proper institution and serve as contact point for the needs of both national and foreign stakeholders and institutions. Funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, the partners of NESTOR are the German libraries, archives and museums, though the objective is to integrate research and other sectors (private sector included). It works in close cooperation with PADI (for the subject gateway) and COPAL, a project funded by the same Ministry which focuses on implementation and is based on the cooperation between German libraries and IBM.

BIRTE CHRISTENSEN DALSGAARD (State and University Library, University of Aarhus - Denmark) spoke of the new Danish law on legal deposit, which establishes the obligation to collect digital resources published on the web or broadcast. She informed the audience that a team of 10 people is now busy setting up the necessary systems, particularly focusing on the definition of 'trusted digital repository'. She then expressed the need to coordinate the work on persistent identifiers and handles, and to define criteria in the librarian sector for selecting and harvesting digital resources. She added that coordination at technical level should be a central aspect of the CA

DANIEL TERUGGI (coordinator of PrestoSpace, Head of Research at INA - France) said that the previous period (from 2002 to today) was necessary to develop an awareness of the *size* of the problem among different communities, from content owners to governments and ministries, and that Europe helped a lot in this sense. He added that the quantity of information and knowledge required in the dp domain (in the audiovisual sector research goes from chemistry to semantics) requires the coordination of the involved communities.

GÖRAN KRISTIANSSON (The National Archives, IT Department – Sweden, Project Manager of the Long Term Preservation Project (LTP) based on the cooperation between National Archives, universities and governmental agencies) stressed the fact that the results in research have to be translated into practice and that the coordination action should also help putting pressure on European governments, also in terms of obtaining the needed funding.

CRISTINA MAGLIANO (ICCU – Roma, coordinator of the National Working Group on Metadata) said that the coordination action could offer the opportunity to build up a European observatory on

standards and best practices for long term preservation, and spoke of the need to work with educational communities, and software vendors and developers.

HANS HOFMAN (The National Archives - The Netherlands) illustrated what was done under the Dutch Presidency, starting from the Conference held in September 2004 in Den Haag. The idea was that there should be less fragmentation and more coordination in this field, so they opted for the concept of a 'Digital Cultural Heritage Continuum'. He then quoted the Resolution of the European Council of 16 November 2004, which establishes new priorities for 2005 and 2006, listing better coordination in digitisation of heritage as one of them. According to Hofman, a coordinating group (like the NRG, but less informal than the current one, and with more commitment from European governments) should support these efforts, and take care of the new action plan that should come into existence 1<sup>st</sup> January 2006. The coordination action should connect and guide these steps.

CECILIA CASTELLANI (Firenze Agenda Experts Group, ICCU) spoke of Iccu's efforts for producing a report on e-government legislation, regulations and policies in the area of digital preservation (with a comprehensive compilation of links to relevant legal sources). A summary of the report's framework was annexed to the meeting's documentation, together with a full report on Italian legislation.

RICHARD BOULDERSTONE (British Library - UK) focused specifically on legal deposits for electronic items. Like in others countries, in the UK they have been working on legal deposit for about ten years, until in 2003 a bill was passed on this. But in order to translate the bill into practice, the Parliament had to pass regulations covering the different types of media, and, up to now, not even the committee for preparing them has been created.

ROSS added that actually pressing for legal deposit as a mechanism could unlock funding, and made the example of New Zealand, where 24 million of dollars to build a repository were unlocked when the national act for legal deposit was eventually passed.

This first plenary session was followed by three breakout groups of discussion: [coordination](#), [research](#), and [commercial](#) engagement in the coordination action.

### **Final Plenary Session**

It was coordinated by Ross. With the help of a roaming microphone, participants were asked to express in a few minutes their point of view on how to take the process ahead. Ross took notes of what they said on a board.

ROSS made a first proposal of how to proceed for putting together a project that is complex, but not that big in size (a three to five year project, funded for about 1 to 2 million euros). The steps could be the following: present, as a group, a bid to the Commission, under the 5<sup>th</sup> comma of the 6<sup>th</sup> framework, for funding a coordination team of about six to seven people. This team should be based in a country with the cheapest points of contact from, so as to reduce travelling costs, and should deliver a series of services. So, instead of choosing the normal strategy (a group of institutions approaching the Commission and each negotiating a piece of a project), the solution (which should be further investigated with the Commission) could be that of proposing to create a single centre that would deliver, for the community, the coordination across a range of activity areas which will developed at various levels.

HILDE VAN WIJNGAARD liked the idea to have a small team responsible for cost issues, but reminded participants that the possible action lines and responsibilities should be shared also on the basis of existing projects (Erpanet, Minerva, Bricks).

DANIEL TERUGGI remarked that an institution is able to invest if that investment brings back a result that is proportional to its investment (in terms of benefits and help for its problem). He agreed with Ross' idea of concentrating the energy in a reduced group of people, and said that there might also be a need for a steering board committee that would organize the work and evaluate the results. He liked the idea of having some case studies or precise objectives that will make the results visible, and proposed to create a website to deposit research questions.



PAOLO BUONORA (State Archives – Italy) said that this process could be defined as one of *pouvoir constituant* in the Rousseauian sense: the creation of the Firenze Agenda experts group was the first step of the process (creating a community), and networking will be the second. And, hopefully, at one point a series of rules, guidelines and laws will be adopted at national level (but rules must always be borne from practice). So that the final step would then be that of having national representatives which will guarantee that rules are applied.

HENRIK JARL HANSEN (National Cultural Heritage Agency – Danish Ministry of Culture) found Ross' proposal very interesting, but noted that it should also be discussed at national level.

MARIA SLIWINSKA (Director of ICIMSS NRG – Poland) returned on what Abid from Unesco had said, stressing the need to go beyond the 25 EU Member States and recognise that the problem is an international one.

MAURIZIO LUNGHI reminded participants what the specific characteristics of a CA are, explaining that it would not directly cover some costs, as those of research activities, but would only cover the costs of linking and coordinating such activities. An idea could be that of creating a group of experts, representing the interests of national institutions, and a Secretariat.

ROSSELLA CAFFO (Library of Modern and Contemporary History – Rome) stressed the need to fully involve in the network all institutions directly working on dp at technical, research and content level, differently than in the case of the Minerva experience.

According to TERUGGI, it would better to first define what the objectives of this dp action are, and then choose its most suitable form (CA, STREP, IP, etc.).

FRANCESCO SAVERIO NUCCI (Engineering Informatica – Italy. BRICKS Project and DILIGENT Project) expressed the need to build a 'human bridge' between the business and technology community and the users community, and offered to contribute to this general effort with the experience gained by the BRICKS Project and its contacts with other international initiatives. He also illustrated the relevance of the issue of open source for the research environment also as a valuable business model. With reference to the question raised by Teruggi, he also stated the need to develop a project with achievable results.

ROSS summed up the debate to that point, saying there seemed to be a general consensus around the idea that the communities involved in digital preservation would benefit from a CA. He also stressed the importance of showing the Commission that the community is organised, active and has a vision, and do that by producing integrated bids in a number of areas.

BOULDERSTONE stressed the need to define a clear and limited agenda for ensuring positive and practical results.

JÖRN SIEGLERSCHMIDT (BSZ, Konstanz – Germany, representing EUBAM) reminded the usefulness to apply the concept of sustainability to projects, for the survival of the projects themselves. This should be based on the commitment of institutions and the possibility to identify as soon as possible a direct support of the involved institutions to the project itself.

ROSS agreed on the last point and on the need to define a future mechanism by which the investments of each institution can be shared effectively and not only at conferences or similar occasions. His point was that it is necessary to build up something that could catalyze the efforts and millions that are invested, and allow the community to coordinate (also with a small contribution from the main European institutions).

## Conclusions

The group agreed to proceed as follows: by the middle of March all participants will find (on the ERPANET Web site) a report with a set of recommended actions and a series of options that all the interested can tick as to the ways they should proceed. Once having gathered all the different opinions on the action, it will be asked who would be prepared to serve on a bid preservation team.

ROSS thanked all participants, and particularly ICCU and Lunghi for organising the event.

SCALA briefly concluded, restating the full interest of Italy in putting together a proposal for a support measure on digital preservation.

## **REPORT FROM COORDINATION BREAK OUT GROUP**

### **Levels of Coordination**

The group tried to define the various levels of coordination which are required when carrying out a European coordination action, and with specific reference to the complex domain of digital preservation.

Three levels have been defined :

1. Community level (institutions and professional environments).
2. Existing networks level ( e.g. DPC, Nestor or other national initiatives).
3. NRG level.

A different degree of obligation could be associated to each of these levels (stronger at the NRG level, weaker at the community level). These various degrees could be translated into different levels of involvement, but in any case (as the BRICKS project representative rightly stressed) the coordination activity should imply rights and obligations at each level of participation.

### **Content of coordination**

With reference to the content of the coordination activity, two relevant and intertwined aspects have been identified:

1. Political coordination.
2. Technical coordination.

A number of critical issues are associated to both these aspects, and the group tried to analyse and evaluate them:

Critical aspects at political level:

1. The role of communication should be enhanced , both in terms of developing a multilingual environment and of fully taking the diversity of traditions into consideration. The problem is not how to 'translate' words and terms from a language to the other, but to 'interpret' their meaning according to a variety of traditions.
2. Need for an overview of the existing networks (their tools and mechanisms, their specific nature):a survey on this may soon be necessary.
3. Need for a concrete and efficient integration action with and amongst major stakeholders (e-government officers, scientific community, pharmaceutical, telecommunication and broadcasting professionals, others)
4. How to guarantee the sustainability of a persistent action in this field is an open question: this aspect should be clearly defined, discussed and developed at the early stage of the project
5. A plan of the needed organizational tools should be drawn up; e.g. creation of a secretariat entrusted with the coordination of specific working groups and special committees. Anyhow, this aspect should be better defined once the framework for the project content will be clearer.

Critical aspects at technical level:

1. Need to define priorities from the technical point of view, so as to make proposals for the coordination action (at training or political level)
2. Within the group, there was general consensus on the need to include training activities in all work-packages.

(Report written by Mariella Guercio)

## **REPORT FROM RESEARCH BREAK OUT GROUP**

### **Coordinator:**

Birte Christensen-Dalsgaard, State University Library, Denmark

### **Participants:**

Cristina Magliano, ICCU, metadata group

AnnaMaris Tammaro, University of Parma

Aziz Abid Unesco, responsible for the Memory of the World Programme

Giuliana di Francesco, Beni Culturali, Minerva, NRG

Giancarlo Buzzanca, Ministry for Cultural Heritage and Activities, webmaster

Hans Hoffman, National Netherlands Archive

Francesco Nucci, Engineering Informatica, Bricks and Diligent

Maurizio Messina, Marciana National Library of Venice, Musical Archiving in Venice

Hilde Wijngaarden, National Library of Netherlands

Daniel Teruggi, Ina, PrestoSpace

### **Questions proposed by the coordinator:**

1. Should the network see Research activity as a core function?
2. Should it conduct research?
3. How can we bring in or integrate ongoing researches into the network?
4. Should we promote research in particular areas?
5. What kind of research is needed (general areas) (e.g. technical, sociological)?
6. How do we make the transition from research to development to services? Should the network engage in the translation of research into practice?
7. Should we validate research in the area of digital preservation?

### **Three levels of research actions were identified:**

1. Academic research: done in a context where it is not conditioned by the application, however having the knowledge of the existing problems. It deals with major unsolved problems.
2. User oriented research: It works in relation to user-identified problems to bring solutions to identified problems. It generally implies an implementation process in order to make results available in a precise context.
3. Innovation survey: what is already existing and how to implement it efficiently. It implies being in contact with research results that could eventually be implemented in real applications.

### **General reactions concerning what a network could do:**

- Should the network validate? Difficult task, maybe drive validation but not take it in charge directly.
- Establish criteria for preservation research in the future and identify domains where research is most needed.
- The implementation of research results is very expensive in terms of time and money. Tools are needed to help calculate costs and time spans?
- Money is oriented to innovative research programs and less to community needs, information actions have to be launched.
- Open-source has to be encouraged and bring more participants from the preservation community to collaborate.
- Open-content access for institutional information and tests is needed.
- How to link existing library information databases between them.
- Establish which lobbying actions towards research communities have to be developed.

- The network is a facilitating one, in order to bring information together as to orient research and users.
- Top-down approach and bottom-up approach are necessary. Network has to make lobbying in both directions

Three actions were proposed that federate all the participants to the workgroup:

1. Set-up a knowledge base in order to link user problems to research group. Special interest research areas should be identified, describing the specificity of the domains that concern digital preservation.
2. Promote the circulation of research results. Bringing the already existing results available to the community.
3. Build a repository with research problems so institutions and companies can advertise on precise problems. The repository would be accessible to the academic research community.

**Open question:** How should it be implemented, what is everybody going to do in order to make the problem advance? An answer would be that what somebody invests should be proportional to what he gets back.

(Report written by Daniel Teruggi)

## REPORT FROM COMMERCIAL BREAK OUT GROUP

This break out group focused on how to engage the commercial sector in digital library activities. We discussed three primary questions:

### 1. Why do we need commercial partners?

- a. Long term sustainable funding – most government & research funding is fixed term so sustainability of funding is always an issue. If a sustainable business model can be created by a commercial organisation it is likely that funding will be available over the longer term.
- b. Some governments are mandating the use of public/private partnerships as grant conditions.
- c. Legal deposit laws require that we negotiate with the rights holders to obtain the best level of access to the publications that we can.
- d. Commercial organisations tend to be more technically advanced so we need to use them to leverage the technology that they have.
- e. Commercial companies can help promote and market our products and services.
- f. We can create partnerships where both parties gain. For example a digitisation project where the commercial partner will digitise some collections items and sell for profit and the library or archive acquires the material for part of its digital collection.

### 2. Why do commercial organisations not participate?

- a. The EU funding only provides 50% of the costs.
- b. The bidding process tends to be overly bureaucratic.
- c. Libraries and archives are trying to provide free services which are in conflict with the commercial providers.
- d. Many commercial organisations are unaware that there are partnership opportunities (should we do awareness raising in this area?).

### 3. What kinds of business opportunities are there?

- a. Commercial Organisations as Buyers
  - i. Use of library or archive physical or virtual space for marketing.
  - ii. Purchase of digital content.
  - iii. Photography of collections items.
  - iv. Advertisements
- b. Commercial Organisations as Partners
  - i. Commercialise results of digitisation where library or archive keeps results of digitisation process.
  - ii. IT Companies can work with very large collections available at libraries and use the work as a case study for marketing purposes.
  - iii. Fulfilment of requests for products and services offered by libraries.
  - iv. Presentation of library information – packaging of genealogical information, health information & etc.
- c. Commercial Organisations as Sellers
  - i. IT Systems for libraries and archives to host collections & etc.
  - ii. Payment systems.
  - iii. Internet and archiving services.
  - iv. Special technologies – e.g. security, cryptography, digital signing & etc.

As a concluding discussion we asked why there was so little work with commercial organisations:

1. Libraries tend to be traditional organisations that do not think about commercial opportunities.
2. Commercial organisations are unaware of potential opportunities.
3. Concerns about creating a true competitive environment for commercial partners for legal and cost reasons.
4. Very few commercially oriented people in libraries and archives.
5. We do not use opportunities such as external exhibitions to involve commercial organisations.

(report written by Richard Boulderstone)

## EVALUATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

There were 32 participants who actively participated in the discussion all day. Of these 31 could have completed the questionnaire (the Chair did not complete a questionnaire). 30 did complete the questionnaire. Percentages are calculated against the number of completed questionnaires.

**(Q1)** Question 1 asked whether participants found the event useful ('Did you find the event useful?') Very much, average, or not at all were the options from which respondents could select.

'Very much' was selected by 21 participants (70%), 9 selected average (27%), and 1 person (3%) left the question blank.

**(Q2)** Question 2 asked 'Do you feel you had enough of a chance to contribute to the discussion?' Yes or no were the options from which respondents could select.

Yes was selected by 28 participants (93%), 1 said no (3.33%), and 1 said they had an average chance (3.33%).

**(Q3)** Question 3 asked 'Do you think we should go ahead in developing a proposal for a digital preservation co-ordination action?'

Yes or no were the options from which respondents could select.

Yes was selected by 27 participants (90%), 1 said no (3.33%), and 2 responded that they did not know (6.67%).

**(Q4)** Question 4 asked 'would it be useful to meet again as we develop the proposal.'

Yes or no were the options from which respondents could select.

Yes was selected by 25 participants (83%), 1 said no (3.33%), 2 said that it depends (6.67%), and 2 did not answer the question (6.67%).

**(Q5)** Question 5 offered participants the opportunity to add comments. 19 of the 30 individuals who completed the evaluation questionnaire provided written comments.

These are:

- Proceedings!
- We must try to make deeper the technologies also in the preparation of the proposal (Web, audio conference, etc).
- It should be clearer the role of experts inside the Firenze Agenda working group; to plan the future initiatives with clear objectives and structural model for organisation.
- It would be very useful to have a constant centre or 'secretariat' for co-ordinating new and old initiatives in digital memory preservation.
- A preliminary draft bid should be outlined prior to any future meeting.
- The results are a bit vague. So the organisers have to invest the time in order to make the vision more concrete. Why you have invested that not before, to get the activity more structure?
- Create a small group that will build the initial proposal.

- Need to be focussed. We need to relate our work to the group of CENL, DLM, and etc.
- Difficult to communicate and coordinate such a large group.
- An IP or STREP could be more appropriate.
- To better define the kind of proposal. To better define the kind of actors involved (Ministries/policy makers or cultural institutions/content managers).
- Have a more clear idea about what the coordination may encompass, which communities should be involved. Connect to EU developments as now taking place in NRG-EU Council resolution of 16-11-2004. The envisaged commitment of governments may also entail funding. The new action plan requires supporting network for instance.
- Coming here I was very sceptical, which was caused by the Firenze Conference. At that time there was no opportunity to be involved. After that the so-called working group was something in name only. If this new CA will include experienced institutions and will really have an opportunity to co-ordinate and include European initiatives, it can be very useful. But it should be focused and do more than just talk.
- A central effort is needed for preservation starting from dissemination of best practices results to driving some priorities. Training should be one of these priorities.
- I think that we could define a bit more definition of objects and business model too. Selection of objects is another problem that each community can resolve. (What to digitalise? Users need, etc). Problem of budget, coordination is essential in EU institutions.
- Use a Web site (working web site with a password if access is only for the participant) to share documents and state of the art for discussion about DP.
- Include in the discussion also archaeologist, historian, documentation expert (So far the discussion has only been between librarian and archivist).
- We need to create a model of cooperation at European level for the preservation. It is necessary to promote the evaluation of the result of research to institutions which need to solve the problems. The action should concentrate on these issues. What will be the role of the secretariat and what will be the role of the partners in the action.
- Their must be co-ordinated action to come up with a strategic plan which will highlight how the proposal would be implemented. Coming up with a proposal only, may not be enough.
- (a) Describe the objectives of the project (what, who, how co-ordinated), (b) interaction of existing national networks, initiatives, and projects must be considered, (c) consider standards and technology, etc (d) multilinguality of concepts, (e) concentration on both political level and research and development, (f) promote European contribution in institutional standardisation initiatives), (g) elucidate the relationship to other communities such as science grid, world data centres, and (h) define target audiences.

(Report written by S.Ross. For calculation purposes Paoli, Fallace, Scala and Ross are not included in the count of attendees).