



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES



Gent, 6 februari 2009



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES

Gent, 6 februari 2009

Schedule

09:30	Reception with coffee/tea
10:00	Welcome and opening of BOM-VI
10:15	Plenary Session + questions & discussion
12:30	Lunch
14:00	Parallel Sessions
17:00	Closing drink

Plenary Session

Moderated by Dries Moreels (Vlaams Theater Instituut vzw)

NATHALIE DOURY, PARIS EN IMAGE, PARIS: Funding digitisation projects by public-private partnerships
BRIDGET MCKENZIE, FLOWASSOCIATES, LONDON: Potential effects of freely available cultural archives
MAX BENOIT, INA, PARIS: l'INA à mi-parcours d'un vaste plan de sauvegarde et de numérisation *
TINE VAN NIEROP, CONSULTANT, AMSTERDAM: Impact of large-scale digitisation efforts on smaller institutions

* This talk will be held in French: a simultaneous translation is provided if necessary

Parallel Afternoon Sessions

Session 1 - FUNDING, moderated by Sylvia Van Peteghem (Boekentoren, Ghent)

JEFF UBOIS, INTELLIGENT TELEVISION, BERKELEY: Contracts between private funders & public institutions
KURT DEGGELLER, MEMORIAV, BASEL: Coordinated efforts and government funding
MEL COLLIER, KULEUVEN, LEUVEN: Business modelling and long-term views

Session 2 - CONTEXT, moderated by Jeroen Walterus (Faro, Brussels)

BERT LOOPER, TRESOAR, LEEUWARDEN: Creating a multisectoral archive of heritage
CEES KLAPWIJK, DIGITALE BIBLIOTHEEK NEDERLANDSE LETTEREN, LEIDEN: The contextual approach of DBNL
PHILLIPPE VAN MEERBEECK, VRT, BRUSSELS: How a change in producing media affects the (re)use of archive

Session 3 - AUDIENCE, moderated by Rony Vissers (Packed, Brussels)

JOS DE HAAN, SOCIAAL PLANBUREAU, DEN HAAG: The virtual culture buff
GRAHAM TURNBULL, RCAHMS/SCRAN, EDINBURGH: SCRAN - Use & Users
RICHARD MORGAN, VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM, LONDON: What's so special about the V&A
THOMAS CHRISTENSEN, DANISH FILM INSTITUTE, COPENHAGEN: New distribution platforms associated dilemmas

Session 4 - DISTRIBUTION, moderated by Gert Nulens (SMIT, Brussels)

THOMAS SEWING, ZDF, MAINZ: The critical success factor for archives: RIM = rights, investments & markets
EERDE HOVINGA, NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR BEELD&GELUID, HILVERSUM: Distribution models used by B&G
DALE PEETERS, UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN, GÖTTINGEN: Open access in growing international repository network



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES

Gent, 6 februari 2009

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS, *Strategies for Multimedia Archives* 06/02/2009

SURNAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANISATION	CITY	SESSION	FUNCTION EMAIL
Basyn	Caroline	Walpurgis	Antwerp, Belgium	3	Participant caroline@walpurgis.be
Benoit	Max	Institut National de l'Audiovisuel	Paris, France	1	Speaker mbenoit@ina.fr
Bomas	Andrika	Universiteit Den Haag	Den Haag, The Netherlands	4	Participant andrika_bomas@yahoo.
Borloo	Filip	Consultant	Brussels, Belgium		Participant filip@borloo.com
Braeckman	Karel	VRT-medialab	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant karel.braeckman@gmail.
Buyse	Annika	Boekenbank	Borgerhout, Belgium	4	Participant annika.buyse@boek.be
Carlier	Wessel	VTi	Brussels, Belgium		IT Support wessel@vti.be
Christensen	Thomas	Danish Film Institute	Copenhagen, Denmark	3	Speaker ThomasC@dfi.dk
Claeyssens	Steven	Koninklijke Bibliotheek Den Haag	Den Haag, The Netherlands	3	Participant steven.claeyssens@kb.n
Cobbaert	Tom	ADVN vzw	Antwerp, Belgium	2	Participant tom.cobbaert@advn.be
Coenen	Caroline	Vlaamse Overheid	Brussels, Belgium	1	Participant carolien.coenen@cjsm.v
Collier	Mel	KULeuven	Leuven, Belgium	1	Speaker mel.collier@bib.kuleuven
Courtois	Cédric	IBBT-MICT-UGent	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant cedric.courtois@ugent.be
Cuypers	Jan	ARGOS	Brussels, Belgium	4	Participant jan.cuypers@watsonwolf
De Buck	Anne	S.M.A.K.	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant anne.debuck@gent.be
De Cannière	Isabelle	VTi	Brussels, Belgium		Org. Committee isabelle.decanniere@gm
De Groef	Eric	VRT	Brussels, Belgium	4	Participant erik.degroef@vrt.be
de Haan	Jos	Sociaal Planbureau	Den Haag, The Netherlands	3	Speaker j.de.haan@SCP.NL

De Meester	Kamiel	K&L Archief	Antwerp, Belgium		Participant	kamielmeester@pand
De Meulemeester	Ann	Biomedische Bibliotheek UGent	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant	ann2.demeulemeester@
De Nil	Bart	Faro	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	bart.denil@faronet.be
De Troyer	Jan	TV Brussel	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	jan.de.troyer@tvbrussel.l
De Vos	Joke	Angelos bvba	Antwerp, Belgium	2	Participant	joke.devos@angelos.be
De Waele	Wim	IBBT	Ghent, Belgium		Participant	wim.dewaele@ibbt.be
De Wit	Dirk	BAM	Ghent, Belgium		Participant	dirk@bamart.be
Debuysere	Stoffel	BAM	Ghent, Belgium	1	Org. Committee	stoffel@bamart.be
Declerck	Tine	Nadine	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant	tine@nadine.be
Declercq	Brecht	VRT	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant	brecht.declercq@vrt.be
Deggeller	Kurt	Memoriav	Basel, Switzerland	1	Speaker	kurt.deggeller@memoria
Dehaes	Jensen	BAM	Ghent, Belgium		Participant	jensen@bamart.be
Deleu	Joannes	IBBT-iLab.t	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	joannes.deleu@intec.ug
Deschrijver	Olivier	IBBT-iLab.t	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	olivier.deschrijver@intec
Dhaese	Nele	Muziektheater Transparant	Antwerp, Belgium	3	Participant	nele@transparant.be
Doury	Nathalie	Paris en Images	Paris, France	3	Speaker	nathalie.doury@parisien
Eeraerts	Joris	Provincie Oost-Vlaanderen	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	joris.eeraerts@oost-vlaa
Esmans	Debbie	Vlaamse Overheid	Brussels, Belgium	1	Participant	debbie.esmans@cjsm.vl
Evens	Tom	IBBT-MICT-UGent	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	tom.evens@ugent.be
Felipe Roque	Dayana	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium		Participant	dayanafr@uclv.edu.cu
Fiseha	Esayas	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	esufish@yahoo.com
Galle	Lies	Letterenhuis Antwerpen	Antwerp, Belgium	3	Participant	lies.galle@stad.antwerpe
Gautama	Sidharta	UGent	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	sid@telin.ugent.be
Gerlings	Job	Watwaswaar	Amsterdam, The Netherlands	1	Participant	job@watwaswaar.nl
Grootfaam Chang	Julia	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	chengjulia@hotmail.com
Harmsen	Henk	DANS	Den Haag, The Netherlands	2	Participant	henk.harmsen@dans.kn
Hartjes	Nathalie	MUHKA	Antwerp, Belgium	1	Participant	roosendaal@muhka.be
Hauttekeete	Laurence	IBBT-MICT-UGent	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	laurence.hauttekeete@u
Heyerick	Florian	Hogeschool Gent/Music Departement	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	florian.heyerick@hogent.
Hochstenbach	Patrick	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	patrick.hochstenbach@u
Hovinga	Eerde	Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid	Utrecht, The Netherlands	4	Speaker	secretariaat@beeldenge
Huys	Frederika	S.M.A.K.	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	frederika.huys@gent.be
Indeherberge	Sarah	FLACC	Genk, Belgium	3	Participant	flacc@skynet.be
Jacob	E.N.	IFLANGI	Den Haag, The Netherlands	2	Participant	eja@knmg.nl
Kerremans	Robin	ICRI KULeuven	Leuven, Belgium	1	Participant	Robin.Kerremans@law.k
Kipaan	Lauren	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium		Participant	lkipaan@yahoo.com

Kiyeng	Mercy	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant meki@mu.ac.ke
Klapwijk	Cees	DBNL	Leiden, The Netherlands	2	Speaker klapwijk@dbnl.org
Kremers	Horst	Horst Kremer	Berlin, Germany	2	Participant office@horst-kremers.de
Lammens	Ellen	IBBT-MMLab-UGent	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant ellen.lammens@ugent.be
Landrie	Romain	Videohouse	Brussels, Belgium	1	Participant Romain.Landrie@videoh
Langelaar	Mies	Gemeentearchief Rotterdam	Rotterdam, The Netherlands	3	Participant m.langelaar@gar.rotterda
Leeuwarden	Herman	Gemeentearchief Rotterdam	Rotterdam, The Netherlands	2	Participant h.vanleeuwarden@gar.ro
Lefrère	Chris	Telenet NV	Mechelen, Belgium	1	Participant chris.lefrere@staff.telene
Lemckert	Henk	Koninklijke Bibliotheek Den Haag	Den Haag, The Netherlands	3	Participant henk.lemckert@kb.nl
Lesage	Annick	VTi	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant annick@vti.be
Looper	Bert	Tresoar	Leeuwarden, The Netherlands	2	Speaker Bert.Looper@Tresoar.nl
Lopez Pasion	Marilou	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant malousyat@yahoo.com
Lybeert	Stijn	Focus WTV vzw	Roeselare, Belgium	4	Participant stijn.lybeert@rmm.be
Lys	An	HVV	Antwerp, Belgium		Participant an.lys@h-vv.be
Mannens	Eric	IBBT-MMLab-UGent	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant erik.mannens@ugent.be
McKenzie	Bridget	Flowassociates	London, United Kingdom	2	Speaker bridget.mckenzie@flowa
Michiels	Marijke	Vlaams Instituut Onroerend Erfgoed	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant marijke.michiels@rwo.vla
Mogollon Guzman	Joanna Noemia	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium		Participant ua040373@uazuay.edu.
Molaudi	Marjorie	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant marjoriem@ul.ac.za
Mollema	Klaas Jan	Haagse Hogeschool/ICT&Media	Den Haag, The Netherlands	4	Participant k.j.mollema@hhs.nl
Moreels	Dries	VTi	Brussels, Belgium		Moderator dries@vti.be
Morgan	Richard	Victoria and Albert Museum	London, United Kingdom	3	Speaker r.morgan@vam.ac.uk
Mostmans	Lien	IBBT-SMIT-VUB	Brussels, Belgium	4	Participant lien.mostmans@vub.ac.b
Msoffe	Grace Emmanuel	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant grace.emmanuel@yahoc
Mulat Mengestie	Tadele	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium		Participant tadele.mulat@ju.edu.et
Niekel	Sabine	Watwaswaar	Amsterdam, The Netherlands	4	Participant sabine@watwaswaar.nl
Nullens	Gert	IBBT-SMIT-VUB	Brussels, Belgium	4	Moderator gert.nulens@vub.ac.be
Ogutu Kisera	Jennifer	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant jwere@uonbi.ac.ke
Ooghe	Bart	VTi	Brussels, Belgium	1	Org. Committee bart@vti.be
Otten	Petra	Adlib Information Systems	Maarsse, The Netherlands	3	Participant p.otten@adlibsoft.com
Pascual	Daphné	Hogeschool Sint-Lukas Brussel	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant daphne.pascual@sintluk
Pauwels	Pieter	UGent/Architecture & Urban Planning	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant pipauwel@gmail.com
Pene	Helena	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant hplafy@hotmail.com
Peters	Dale	Universität Göttingen	Goettingen, Germany	4	Speaker peters@sub.uni-goetting
Plaza	Victoria	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium		Participant vplaza@espol.edu.ec
Posthumus	Etienne	Arkyves ICONCLASS	Amsterdam, The Netherlands	3	Participant etienne@mnemosyne.or

Proot	Goran	Bibliotheek UA	Antwerp, Belgium	2	Participant	goran.proot@ua.ac.be
Robensyn	Kim	Amsab Instituut	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	kim.robensyn@amsab.be
Robrechts	Tim	ICRI KULeuven	Leuven, Belgium	4	Participant	tim.robrechts@law.kuleu
Rodriquez Bilbao	Patricia	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	akire_48@hotmail.com
Roels	Geert	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	4	Photographer	geert.roels@ugent.be
Rose	Chris	Tessella	Den Haag, The Netherlands	2	Participant	chris.rose@tessella.com
Rotthier	Isabel	Universiteitsarchief Gent	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	isabel.rotthier@ugent.be
Rutten	Peter	Innovatiecentrum Oost-Vlaanderen	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	peter.rutten@innovatiece
Salliau	Frank	Boekenbank	Borgerhout, Belgium	4	Participant	frank@boek.be
Savels	Maarten	Amsab Instituut	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant	maarten.savels@amsab.
Schaule	Sonja	eDAVID	Berchem, Belgium	2	Participant	sonja.schaule@edavid.b
Scheltjens	Saskia	UGent/Faculty of Arts & Humanities	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant	saskia.scheltjens@ugent
Schoutteet	Abram	Comsof	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	abram.schoutteet@coms
Sewing	Thomas	ZDF	Mainz, Germany	4	Speaker	Gsimbsl.M@zdf.de
Snelting	Femke	Constant	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant	snelting@collectifs.net
Stalpaert	Christel	UGent	Ghent, Belgium	1	Participant	christel.stalpaert@ugent.
Steylaerts	Katrijn	ACE Digital House	Brussels, Belgium	4	Participant	katrijn@ace-postproduct
Streefkerk	Marco	DEN	Den Haag, The Netherlands	4	Participant	marco.streefkerk@den.n
Therry	Marc	Rijksarchief Kortrijk	Kortrijk, Belgium	2	Participant	marc.therry@arch.be
Thiers	Liesbeth	Erfgoedcel C07	Ieper, Belgium	2	Participant	liesbeth.thiers@co7.be
Torz	Katarzyna	Polish Audiovisual Publishers	Warsaw, Poland	2	Participant	sekretariat@pwa.gov.pl
Turnbull	Graham	RCAHMS/SCRAN	Edinburgh, United Kingdom	3	Speaker	Graham.Turnbull@rcahn
Ubois	Jeff	Intelligent Television	Berkeley, United States	1	Speaker	jeff@ubois.com
Van Borm	Julien	Bibliotheek UA	Antwerp, Belgium	2	Participant	j.van.borm@telenet.be
Van Caneghem	Luc	Lawyer	Brussels, Belgium	4	Participant	luc.van.caneghem@cew
Van Conkelberge	Veerle	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	veerle.vanconkelberge@
Van de Walle	Rik	IBBT	Ghent, Belgium		Participant	rik.vandewalle@ugent.be
Van der Linden	Hans	Agentschap Kunsten en Erfgoed	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant	hans.vanderlinden@cjsm
Van Dyck	Jos	New Generation Media	Mechelen, Belgium	1	Participant	jos.van.dyck@scarlet.be
Van Dyck	Ruth	VHIC	Goes, The Netherlands	2	Participant	r.vandyck@vhic.nl
Van Godtsenhoven	Karen	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	karen.vangodtsenhoven@
Van Goethem	Jan	De Munt	Brussels, Belgium		Participant	j.vangoethem@demunt.b
Van Heddegem	Joannes	BOM-vl Steering Committee	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant	joannes.vanheddegem@
van Hooland	Seth	Université Libre de Bruxelles	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant	svhooland@ulb.ac.be
van Kampen	Paul	VRT	Brussels, Belgium		Participant	paul.van.kampen@event
Van Meerbeeck	Phillippe	VRT	Brussels, Belgium	2	Speaker	Philippe.VANMEERBEE

Van Melle	Liesbeth	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	liesbeth.vanmelle@ugent.be
van Nierop	Tine	Consultant	Amsterdam, The Netherlands	1	Speaker	tinevannierop@gmail.com
Van Nieuwerburgh	Inge	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	3	Org. Committee	Inge.VanNieuwerburgh@ugent.be
Van Ongeval	Isabelle	Letterenhuis Antwerpen	Antwerp, Belgium	3	Participant	isabelle.vanongeval@sta.be
van Paassen	Remco	Tessella	Den Haag, The Netherlands	1	Participant	remco.vanpaassen@tessella.nl
Van Passel	Eva	IBBT-SMIT-VUB	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	eva.van.passel@vub.ac.be
Van Peteghem	Sylvia	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	1	Moderator	Sylvia.VanPeteghem@UGent.be
Vandendriessche	Yana	Boekentoren	Ghent, Belgium	3	Org. Committee	YanaFrauke.Vandendriessche@ugent.be
Vanderhaegen	Greet	Museum Het huis van Alijn	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	greet.vanderhaegen@huisvanalijn.be
Vazquez Meza	Katia	VUB/Stimiuc	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	aitakzeuqsav@gmail.com
Vercammen	Els	VUB/Universiteitsbibliotheek	Brussels, Belgium	2	Participant	els.vercammen@vub.ac.be
Vergauwe	Geert	Hogeschool Gent/KASK	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant	geert.vergauwe@hogent.be
Vermassen	Jan	Lukas - Art in Flanders/reproductiefonds	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	jan@lukasweb.be
Vermeersch	Brigitte	VRT	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	Brigitte.Vermeersch@vrt.be
Vermeulen	Brecht	IBBT-iLab.t	Ghent, Belgium		Participant	brecht.vermeulen@intec.be
Vermeulen	Werner	Comsof	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	werner.vermeulen@comsof.be
Verplancke	Nico	IBBT	Ghent, Belgium	4	Participant	Nico.verplancke@ibbt.be
Verreyke	Hélène	Faro	Brussels, Belgium	2	Org. Committee	helene.verreyke@faronet.be
Verstraete	Geert	Victoria Deluxe	Ghent, Belgium	3	Participant	geert@victoriadeluxe.be
Verwayen	Harry	Kennisland	Antwerp, Belgium	4	Participant	hv@kl.nl
Vissers	Rony	Packed	Brussels, Belgium	3	Moderator	rony@packed.be
Vuijsteke	Carlo	Muziekcentrum Vlaanderen	Brussels, Belgium	1	Org. Committee	carlo.vuijsteke@muziekcentrumvlaanderen.be
Waegeman	Luc	Muziekcentrum Kinky Star vzw	Ghent, Belgium		Participant	luc@kinkystar.com
Walterus	Jeroen	Faro	Brussels, Belgium	2	Moderator	jeroen.walterus@faronet.be
Warson	Yves	EWI Vlaanderen	Brussels, Belgium	4	Participant	yves.warson@ewi.vlaanderen.be
Wiercx	Bram	Faro	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	bram@faronet.be
Witkamp	Paula	DANS	Den Haag, The Netherlands	4	Participant	paula.witkamp@dans.kn.nl
Wittebolle	Michel	Kanaalz	Brussels, Belgium	3	Participant	michel.wittebolle@kanaalzone.be
Zioga	Anna	Hellenic National Audiovisual Archive	Kallithea, Greece	3	Participant	azioga@avarchive.gr
Zoeteman	Roderick	Hogeschool Gent/Informatisering	Ghent, Belgium	2	Participant	roderick.zoeteman@hogent.be



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES

Gent, 6 februari 2009

PLENARY SESSION REPORT

Cultural, heritage and media institutions face a number of challenges when moving even a part of their collection and archival management into the digital age. This conference aims to contribute to the international discourse on the impact of 'going digital' by focusing on four specific questions that newly developing multimedia archives are faced with: how do you position yourself to the need for funding; how is context created and maintained in the multidisciplinary digital archive; what audience do you aim to reach and how do you reach them; and what distribution models can you use?

Nathalie Doury (Paris en Image, Paris): Funding digitization projects by public-private partnerships

How does Paris digitize its cultural heritage and what lessons did it learn from it? That's the main question Nathalie Doury tried to answer during her lecture. The city of Paris has no less than 15 heritage institutions controlling together a collection of ca. three million items, of which remarkably many photographs. Among the different heritage institutions heterogeneous forms of (non digital) reproduction, distribution and collection management systems existed, however. As Paris additionally herited the photography collection of Roger Viollet (good for not less than 7 million pictures), the city was obliged to find a way to bring homogeneity in the (digital) reproduction, to create a space for preserving and distribution and to find a partner to manage the Viollet collection. The solution was the foundation of a semi public company that would manage this collection and would start to digitize, unlock (metadata) and distribute the other photography collections of the city.

Regarding reproduction, Parisienne de Photographie engages in the digitization of photographs, the digitization on-demand of non photographic material (ex. city maps), the integration of metadata and the recommendation concerning best practices of digitization. The goal is the digitization of 60.000 items a year. A committee defines the priorities and bases its choice on a distributive code of 1/3 for preservation, 1/3 for museum activities and 1/3 for commercial use.

Concerning distribution, Parisienne de Photographie delivers digital reproductions to the governmental services, offers online access to reproductions and manages the reproduction rights.

Parisienne de Photographie has a year budget of 3,2 million euro and a team of 40 staff members. The first year, it invested 400.000 euro in material. The city contributes 600.000 euro per year, 75% of the budget is derived from own income (from the reproduction rights).

Until now, Parisienne de Photographie succeeded to achieve its qualitative goals: its business model is sustainable, the collections are more visible and a common methodology is developed regarding metadata. Less positive are the sometimes difficult collaboration between the different heritage institutions and lots of time and man power needed to prepare digitization.

Bridget McKenzie (Flowassociates, London): Context in interdisciplinary archives

How can we reach a maximal outreach by bringing together national heritage collections and by responding to the current subjects? How can we involve the audience and help to extend the collective memory? McKenzie highlighted the growing "infodiversity" in the digital age and the necessity of collaboration and maximal audience implication in the unlocking of content. The creation of filters and grids must allow service providers to do something with the content, as for example data mining.

In the post-digital age, a museum is no longer restricted to a building or physical location. From now on, the 'museum experience' can be displaced to the living room and marketed as an intimate experience via online digitized collections. Additionally, unknown possibilities of creativity are offered: visitors can tag content, make mash-ups or edit content. Virtual collections of different museums can be connected. Although some resistance is shown by the museums who want to build up their own experience for their users, it offers extra possibilities to these visitors. McKenzie cited the example of Memory Maker in New Zealand

(<http://remix.digitalnz.org>): visitors can remix New Zealand's history themselves. An other example is the Brooklyn Museum of Art, where visitors are encouraged to tag content.

Bridget McKenzie concluded with the statement that heritage institutions need more than ever to follow an 'open culture' in their digital strategy and, as subsidization is not always evident, to involve the audience as much as possible in the unlocking of content.

Max Benoit (INA, Paris): INA, halfway to a broad saving and digitization plan

In 1974 INA, Institut national de l'Audiovisuel, was founded: the French national institute of radio and television. Its mission is threefold: to preserve, disseminate and validate the archive collections and the knowledge build up over the years.

INA's collection is divided in 2 categories. The historical archive contains 70 years of radio and television programs, representing 1.400.000 hours of public radio and TV. Main challenge here is to deal with all the problems of managing a large, analogue, audiovisual collection and the difficulties arising out of the different formats used throughout the years. To treat these problems a digitalization project was started in 2000 to digitize 850.000 hours of endangered material by 2015, to preserve it for future generations and to open it up to the public. Since INA owns the copyright on this material, they could decide on the dissemination of the archives. To select the material a committee was set up to guide INA, consisting of historians, philosophers, artists, and others. Their task was not to select individual items but to define the general concepts of the selection process. The difficult part was to convince the government of investing in this endeavor.

The second part of the collection is more recent. It is the legal deposit of radio and television programs, both commercial and public, since 1992. INA archives the collections, but does not own the rights. INA acts as a mediator between the owner and the user. Since 1992 2.100.000 hours is deposited.

On these collections several portals are implemented: for research, professionals, education and the general public. Depending on the profile of the user, collections can be viewed, downloaded, reused. Researchers can view documents in the legal deposit for free, others have to pay. Everyone can view low resolution video from the public archive, but has to pay for download or DVD in high resolution. This business model generates profits, divided between the rights holders and INA. 1/3 of the annual budget is generated by the commercial activities. For 2/3 of its budget INA has to rely on public funds. INA takes up to 3% of the budget for public tv and radio.

The website of INA now provides access to 100.000 hours of the archival collection. The general public can view this archive but has to pay for a download or a dvd. For education some material of INA is integrated in an educational website, Jalons, initiated by the ministry of education.

Tine van Nierop (Consultant, Amsterdam): Why small institutions should collaborate to digitize now

Every institution, large and small, struggles with the same pressure to be visible on the web. Moreover, they have the same needs concerning the fast decay of the audiovisual carriers and face the same challenge to preserve the material for future generations. Bigger institutions, however, receive funding to set up prestigious projects including mass digitization and fancy, expert websites. A beautiful example is "Images for the future", which received 150 million euro funding to digitize thousands of hours of video, film and audio. Smaller institutions remain often empty handed. And that is why they should collaborate. Together they can form strategic alliances and address the government to stress the importance of local collections to the community. Knowledge and experiences can be shared, costs can be kept under control. Lots of reasons to partner up.

But before a strategic partnership can be set up, common goals must be defined, and, more importantly, an inventory of the collections should be drafted to be able to set up criteria and estimate the budget. And that is often a problem in these smaller institutions. They don't have the means to invest in such an effort. To get help from the large institutions is not realistic. They work on a different level, too advanced to be copied. The only solution is to team up and collaborate, share knowledge and facilities.



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES

Gent, 6 februari 2009

FUNDING REPORT SESSION 1

This session elaborated on the question of how digitization efforts can be financed, and how heritage institutions relate their mission of preserving and unlocking cultural material to the necessity of finding financial means for the realization of this mission. This topic was approached from three different angles.

In his talk on public-private partnerships for digitisation, **Jeff Ubois** (Intelligent Television, Berkeley) began by debunking some general prejudices concerning the digitization of audiovisual collections. According to him, the old medium will eventually be converted into a new and probably less long-lived medium whether heritage sector wants it or not. Fears on the longevity of digital documents are generally justified, but at the same time much is yet unknown on the actual life-span of these documents. And as for film delivering the best quality, this may in the near future no longer be the case as digitization quality increases and digitization costs drop. Additionally, many users may not even expect more than 'youtube quality' for their AV. Considering that changes will happen, Jeff Ubois argued to meet the rising challenges with a progressive but intelligent attitude. The social engagement and public responsibility of heritage institutions dictates that they keep up with their time.

One of the practical and ethical effects of these changes is the increasing necessity for collaborated effort; public-private partnerships are one such option. As ill-conceived partnerships can be dangerous, institutions need to deal with the existing principles and consult available guidelines as much as possible. Jeff proposed some such guidelines based on an RLG-sponsored analysis of Google digitization agreements and the principles found in *Lot 49*, the *NARA principles* and the *Open Content Alliance*. Central issues to keep in mind are: avoid limitations on the right to consult with third parties; define qualities and formats and hang on to ownership; aim for open access; make sure to be able to distribute your content; define how to deal with 'usage data'; and make sure that limitations on ownership expire when the contract ends. With these and other elements in mind, heritage institutions should be better placed to build partnerships while staying true to their mission.

Kurt Deggelliers (Memoriav, Basel) lecture gave an overview of the history and approach of Memoriav, a collaboration between several Swiss organisations for the preservation and disclosure of audiovisual heritage. It showed how the problems posed by a fragmented cultural field – due to sovereignty of the 26 Swiss cantons in terms of cultural policy – could be partially overcome by the creation of a central platform for audiovisual archiving. Founded in 1984, supported by the government since 1988 and officially active under the name Memoriav since 1990, the initiative hoped to exceed the political division by pooling the expertise of the National Library, the Federal Archives, the Federal Communication Service, the Public Radio and Television, the National Film Archive, the National Sound Archives, and the Institution for the Preservation of Photography. Originally, the institutions participated on a voluntary basis. Now funding is provided on a project-based level. The initiative sets up partnerships with institutions from the cantons, whereby 50% of the costs are supported by Memoriav and 50% by the partner institutions. The latter remain owner of all the resulting digital materials and Memoriav receives the necessary metadata to centralize the access to these. Memoriav hereby plays a guiding and supporting role, without acting as a repository or as an external authority. The case illustrated the necessity for collaboration and increasing expertise and access for the preservation of this fragmented and fragile heritage, and showed how this might be accomplished through collaborative efforts without resulting in a centralized institution or mega-repository.

The third presentation was given by **Mel Collier** (KULeuven, Leuven), who provided a closer look into the role of services as a way of making heritage programmes sustainable and attractive for third-party financial collaboration. Sustainability is a difficult issue here, since few institutions have an official digital archiving policy and important questions remain therefore unanswered: what is the value of digitization, who are the users, what is the potential market, which technologies are available, what are the risks, what are the

costs,... The question of what to select and how (both in terms of digitization and of *born-digital* documents), how to engage collaborations between public and private institutions, and what the EU policy will be (more money on EU level seems indeed to be available) remain problematic, too. A central factor was the realization that where the provider of access is not the rightsholder to the material – and this is most often the case – there can be no question of producing revenue from the digitized materials themselves. As a result, Mel proposed that it would be the added services which would most likely attract both an audience and potential financiers. Sustainability then becomes a matter of retrieving some of the initial cost, rather than making the service as a whole economically viable. He provided a number of examples which pointed in this direction, from the Ithaka-JISC study showing how academics are often unfamiliar with commercial lines of thought, and the Ontario Digital Library example of the positive impact of a simple, one-step access to the available material, to Europeana, which hopes to get 15% of its funding from private means, by attracting audiences and advertisers through the its critical mass of materials and the introduction of social networking possibilities. His conclusion was that such partnerships may indeed play a part in retrieving some of the invested money. As a whole, however, he felt that cultural endeavors would always rely heaviest on government funding, and that the time has come for these governments to expand their views and accept the need for much larger-scale efforts in digitizing culture.

The conclusions of these talks and of the discussion which ensued were therefore promising and challenging alike. In light of the pervasively digital nature of every-day life and the necessity for heritage institutions to venture into this digital realm, it seems that partnerships are the logical way to share expertise and financial means. Cooperation may help pool fragmented resources, enhance knowledge of the heritage itself and enhance the ways in which this heritage reaches the public. Meanwhile, collaborations between public and private or commercial initiatives may provide financial means and possibilities which would not be available otherwise. However, heritage institutions must always remain true to their primary mission to protect and disseminate the public heritage. This implies that careful deliberation must proceed any possible commercial attachments, as public heritage should in one way or another remain public in nature and there are ethical issues on the use of this material for commercial purposes. Meanwhile, the nature of heritage collections will most likely imply that their direct commercial uses would be limited, and heritage institutions should therefore expect at best to regain only a fraction of the costs of the digital effort. Society as a whole, and government in particular, will have to carry most of the financial burden of digital heritage. And, if the remarks of the speakers and the audience are an indication, there seems to be reasonable consensus that this is the way it should be.



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES

Gent, 6 februari 2009

CONTEXT REPORT SESSION 2

In this digital world the possibilities for presenting collections in a contextualised framework are infinite. In this session, we want to explore how and why context is created in a digital environment. Three institutions, from the heritage field and the broadcasting sector, presented their experience with the generation of content in interdisciplinary digital archives. Bert Looper talked about the Frisian archive Tresoar, which he argued is the gatekeeper of the collective memory of the region Friesland in the Netherlands. Cees Klapwijk led us through the history of the development of the Digital Library for Dutch Literature, a platform for the cultural heritage of Flanders and the Netherlands, and Philippe Van Meerbeeck illustrated the crossmedia policy of the Flemish public broadcaster VRT with a few recent cases.

Bert Looper (Tresoar, Leeuwarden) presented the archive Tresoar and 'the many contexts of Friesland (Frieslân)'. In his talk, he discussed the aims of Tresoar, how they present the collection in a digital environment and how they create context. In 2002 three archives merged into Tresoar¹. These archives played an important part in the transmission of the cultural heritage of Friesland. Bert Looper sees Tresoar as a gatekeeper, preserving the heritage for the future, but also providing access to the digital collection. It is no longer sufficient to just display objects, we have to place the object in its context and present this story to the visitor. Julian Spalding explains in his 'Poetic Museum' that we have to extract the deeper and hidden meaning of objects and that each document has the potential to stir the imagination. Bert Looper believes that the institution, as a gatekeeper, has the responsibility not only to provide access to the collection, but also to create a framework for presenting the cultural heritage within its different contexts. This is the social role of the 'memory institution' in our society. Tresoar also wants to participate to community building. By using the aquabrowser, communities can search for content related to their interest and recontextualise the collection.

In his presentation 'Text, context and contest. Creating access to a shared written heritage' **Cees Klapwijk** (Digitale Bibliotheek Nederlandse Letteren, Leiden) led us through the development history of the Digital Library for Dutch Literature, an institution which provides access to a collection of historical and modern texts on the cultural history of the Netherlands and Flanders. By presenting this history, Cees Klapwijk wanted to illustrate how digitisation plans sometimes give inspiration to present the collection in a context-related environment. The project was started up in the early nineties within the University Library of Leiden, the Netherlands, and also received finances from The Dutch Ministry of Education. They first invested in the technical infrastructure, after which they were inspired to create a knowledge network on Dutch language and literature. This small collection was received very well, which stimulated the organisation to be more ambitious. However, in the mean while it became clear that there existed differing visions within the University Library of Leiden. A new organisation was founded by the Society for Dutch Literature, with the aim to build a digital library on the literature and language of the Low Countries. Three other Dutch and Flemish institutions also joined the organisation. By this time, there was no longer a formal relation between the new digital library and the old University Library of Leiden. Extra funding by the NWO and the Dutch Language Union consolidated the organisation and a new aim was set "to create a digital library, specified as a digital collection with primary and secondary information on Dutch language and literature and its historical, societal and cultural context." Cees Klapwijk then explained the production process of scanning, encoding and dataconversion and illustrated that the ground work for contextualisation is laid out when encoding the documents.

¹ The Public Records Office in Friesland, the Provincial and Buma Library and the Frisian Literary Museum and Documentation Centre.

Philippe Van Meerbeeck (VRT, Brussels) talked about 'Crossmedia: new context for old archive' and how the 'create once and publish many' policy affects the use of the archive of the Flemish public broadcaster VRT. He illustrated this with several cases, like Gedichtendag or Flemish Poetry Day, the Flemish tv-youth series 'Tienerklanken' and last years fiftieth anniversary of Expo '58. For the Flemish Poetry day, a selection of archive material on poetry was digitised and shown on the cultural portal Klara.be. On this website, cliché's on poetry like 'poets are drunks' or 'poems have to be about great things' were invalidated by showing archive material from the early days of television. With the same content a linear program was made and broadcasted on Canvas+. These two media are different in that respect that television is 'lean back', while the internet is 'hands on'. Another case was the rediscovery of the Flemish tv-youth series 'Tienerklanken' by tv-maker Peter Van De Veire. A clip of Moody Bleus was restored and came to his attention, on which he promptly started using fragments of 'Tienerklanken' as a regular item in his tv-show, which reached a large audience every week. Philippe Van Meerbeeck emphasised that by broadcasting archive material in this context, we can convince the public of value of the archives. As a result, a newspaper article was also published "De VRT zit op een berg goud", reporting on the enormous potential of the tv-archive. The final example concerns the large amount of expo items which were digitised and used in several media on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Expo '58 in Brussels last year. Material from the earliest days of television were used in television and radio programs, by the television news, on websites, a DVD was made and a cross medial event was organised. Now the VRT is digitising its most fragile archive material within the framework of the DIVA digitising project.



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES

Gent, 6 februari 2009

AUDIENCE REPORT SESSION 3

This session focused on how users deal with digital material and how institutions make material available for different users, with different backgrounds and purposes. One of the underlying hardships of user studies are the differences between users: it's important to maximize the services and website for as many different groups of users as possible. The main proposition of this afternoon session was to 'listen to the users', and to 'dare to question yourself', since very often the users' opinion is very different from that of the institution. As with all digital developments, it is necessary to stay on top of cultural changes and not to be afraid of the challenges ahead.

Jos De Haan (Sociaal Planbureau, Den Haag) formulated a few conclusions in response to user surveys of Sociaal Planbureau that concerned an inquiry into the profile of the 'cultural visitor', in particular his/her use of the internet and cultural websites as a source for information about museum or theatre visits. De Haan pointed towards the evolution taking place from the user as a *consumer* to the user as a *producer* in the participation in culture (this is often called the 'prosumer'). New media possibilities make more active participation possible. The question remains whether we all are 'prosumers' already. Some numbers illustrate the situation in the Netherlands: they are leading in internet (broadband) diffusion and there is a relatively high level of cultural participation. The technical opportunities are nowadays very high, but to what extent one uses these opportunities for cultural visits and participation?

According to the speaker, there are four types of internet use for cultural purposes, presented in the so-called ICET-model: (1) for information, (2) for communication and community, (3) for entertainment and personal development and (4) for transaction. Additionally, he distinguishes 'nine user profiles' of the cultural heritage (see slides) correlating with nine 'types' of cultural interest: (1) 'allrounders' (4%), (2) 'art-lovers' (8%), (3) 'interest/hobby groups' (6%), (4) 'collectors' (8%), (5) 'bite-size types' (9%), (6) 'family outings' (16%), (7) 'day trippers' (11%), (8) 'readers' (9%) and at last the (biggest) group who isn't interested in culture at all (29%). Groups 1, 2 and 5 use the internet for 100% for their cultural purposes and interests. Groups 7, 8 and 9 consult never internet for that purpose and the other groups seldom. The main conclusion is that there need to be at least a major interest in cultural heritage in the *offline* world to show interest in culture in the *online* world.

De Haan concluded that internet is used most often for practical information, that the profile of digital visitors resemble that of physical visitors (age is an exception), that a website is primarily used before a visit, that media habits are the most important restriction (mostly for elderly) and that the stimulating general characteristics are 24 hours availability, ease, speed and chair selection on theater ticketing sites.

Thomas Christensen (Danish Film Institute, Copenhagen) situated the Danish Film Institute¹ in the digital age by pointing several digital strategies: (1) cinematheque, videotheque and library (a venue for film activities for a general audience), (2) the National Filmography (for a general audience, documentation about 5241 films, Danish short fiction films and documentary films), (3) Filmstriben (for education and schools, online access to more than 500 films, non-commercial distribution), (4) European Film Gateway (EU-project between 14 film archives, a pan-European cinema heritage database), (5) Danish Ministry of Culture (for the national heritage).

Christensen stressed some digital dilemmas. It turns out that users are generally interested in downloading films for free, often because older films are not available anymore. It's hard to be against the downloading but it remains illegal. A lot of films will never be commercially available so it's the task of DFI to offer access

¹ The Danish Film Institute (DFI) is the Danish government agency responsible for supporting and encouraging film and cinema culture and for conserving these in the national interest. It started in 1997 and is actually three-in-one: Danish Film Institute (feature films), National Film Board (shorts & docs) and the Danish Film Museum (archives).

to these films. But public archives are seeing rising preservation costs, rising access expectations, and rising difficulties and costs in the rights domain. The high costs diminish the number of films that can be made available. Cultural consumers, especially the younger generation, are becoming used to free (illegal) access to cultural products.

But there are also digital possibilities. It seems necessary to exploit the new potentials of digital cinema and HDTV distribution to optimize the quality of film heritage. Furthermore, territorial rooting and authenticity through the documentation of context are important factors to create relevance, also online. Another suggested possibility is the offer of online technology for legal access and the constant observation of Creative Commons evolutions in order to come to new IP laws and business models.

Graham Turnbull (SCRAN, Edinburgh) stressed that what your own collection holds, is not for your own audience but for a European and international audience. The target audience of the online cultural collection SCRAN² varies from professionals, academic to laymen, who all have different interests and purposes. A very important discovery was the evaluation of the website: the SCRAN-team and designers were very pleased with the result and the design of the site, but the users disapproved. Designers are thus certainly not always the ones in the know of what users want. The site seemed not user friendly enough and it had to look more like a 'Disney website' as a user survey suggested (e.g. the colours, the search bar, dynamic, attractive icons, round buttons,...). To please all users, different versions of the website were offered to the different user groups (library page, school websites,...). The design differed and the content was slightly different. But in general the websites were the same.

Turnbull highlighted a few other important criteria: the site has to meet existing standards (e.g. OAI-PMH) in consideration of interoperability and interaction between different institutions. Another important aspect is to offer all kinds of user tools (e.g. pathfinders, features, relevance ranking, toolbar – because users want to *do* something with a picture, just *find* one is not enough anymore,...). The speaker went on to give some examples of *reuse* possibilities of the digital material (e.g. for college projects, exam papers, social network platforms,...). An important conclusion with regard to the *reuse* of digital material is the existing of a significant discrepancy between what one *thinks* people will use the material for and what one *actually* does with it. So the importance and need of constant user studies was once again demonstrated.

An excerpt from the main conclusions of Turnbull: '*finding* material is no longer enough, but *doing* something with it', 'it's theirs, not ours', '*they* are a group, engage the group', 'watch your specialist language', 'listen to the user', 'synthesize what you are told (take the entire scope in consideration)', 'do simple things very well', 'wonderful design can conceal not reveal', 'your site must grow and flex',... with the key conclusion 'design to *use*, not for you!'

Finally, **Richard Morgan** (Victoria and Albert Museum, London) concluded the session with an outline of the situation in the Victoria and Albert Museum. The museum counts more than one million art and design objects, from which only 30.000 objects can be found online, a very low and disappointing percentage (3%). Digitization, and getting the core content of the V&A online is one of the basic objectives of the museum, but digital projects present specific challenges to museums. It is for example necessary that one is able to retrieve the collection of the V&A on Google or Google images, because 90% of the users start with Google when they want to find something.

The opinion of V&A is that not the content but the idioms have to change. It is important to evolve with the new audiences who are not in the museums. What can V&A do for them? Where are the audiences? If the V&A wants to find new audiences, they have to go to Web 2.0 platforms, such as Facebook and iGoogle, and be interoperable with them (e.g. search through catalogue via FB profile). Important characteristics of the online collections are: dynamic, interesting but also relaxing, possibility to download the pictures and share or reuse them in mashups. This often creates new creative content and engages the audience with your collection.

Recently, the V&A joined the National Museums Online Learning Project, where nine of the UK's leading museums and galleries will be combining their own online collections. The collections are available through *WebQuests* and *Creative Spaces*. A *WebQuest* is an online educational tool for use by pupils and teachers, promoting open-ended investigation to solve specific tasks. And the *Creative Spaces* concept is a social web application that will enable users to search across the museum partner collections, document how the collections have inspired their own creative work and process, and share their work and ideas with a like-minded community. It is a social network especially catering to the art world, which is part of a new wave on the net: more and more platforms emerge that cater to specific audiences.

² SCRAN is an online cultural collection, a charity & online learning resource base with over 360.000 images & media from museums, galleries, archives and the media. It peak serves 980.000 hits a day. SCRAN started 12 years ago and it gathers the digital collections of different cultural institutions in Scotland.



STRATEGIES FOR MULTIMEDIA ARCHIVES

Gent, 6 februari 2009

DISTRIBUTION REPORT SESSION 4

Digital content can be distributed via different models. This session aims to present different examples of digital content distribution models, ranging from content for use within the media sector, to models used to distribute heritage content for educational purposes. Three speakers were invited to address this topic, each from different perspectives. Thomas Sewing (ZDF Enterprises Group) conveyed a commercial narrative, Eerde Hovinga (the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision) discussed content distribution from an educational content provider's perspective and Dale Peters (State and University Library of Göttingen) advocated a model for open access for research data.

Eerde Hovinga would state mid-session that archives are economic (f)actors. **Thomas Sewing** (ZDF Archiv&ZDF.digital productions, Mainz) firmly substantiated this finding. Formally introduced by Sewing as a 'brand' of ZDF, ZDF Archiv distributes 300.000 different programs, ranging over a period of 40 years. Noticeably, they aim for a 360° roll-out, meaning that content should be appropriate for radio, tv, online and mobile distribution. Therefore it is not very surprising that ZDF Archiv regularly works with major actors in the audiovisual industry such as YouTube, Vodafone, VOD portals and other (mobile) actors. Sewing emphasised that they mainly work on a B2B basis; audience questions about an engagement to less commercial activities were accordingly responded with 'free is not our target market' (paraphrased). In the first place, their catalogue consists of factual content, but recently they broadened their collection to music performances and various sorts of clips. Moreover, the enterprise acts as mediator with respect to copyrights and distribution rights. Persistently looking for what makes archives successful, they developed business models which are for instance based on footage sale with guaranteed sums and streaming, but they also consider other models such as download-to-own and revenue share models with pre-roll advertising.

In his talk, **Eerde Hovinga** (Nederlands Instituut voor Beeld en Geluid, Hilversum) indicated the economic aspect of archives. Although speaking from a different perspective, i.e. the educational content market, and with a different driving force, Hovinga too is engaged with the question of how to make money out of archives. Unlike the straightforward commercial B2B exploitation of audiovisual content of ZDF Archiv, the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision has to come up with a return on their government investment as part of the subsidy agreement. Their customer groups are various markets. Firstly, with 2 million pupils education is a large market in The Netherlands. Secondly, the institute also sees the opportunities and values of B2B services, because, as Hovinga stated, 'when you digitise your archive, you double its use'. Lastly, they reach the broad consumer market via DVD productions, websites and their notable flag ship building.

However, he emphasised that the consumer market alone is not sufficient to make large revenues. The institute is primarily aimed at the educational market, and has accordingly developed business models for distributing content from their vast archive. Within the institute, there was a strong emphasis on doing research before launching costly platforms on the one hand and on thinking about copyright issues on the other hand (for example: what is a reasonable fee for copyrights?). Moreover, marketing is also an important part of the process. Several educational platforms have been put in place. In the future, there will be a freely accessible content source pool (Teleblik), and a premium version (ED-IT). The added value of the latter lies in the usability and how teachers and students can integrate content in the school curriculum. As a new aggregator platform, ED-IT will offer highly contextualised content via a license model. Teachers will be able to upload and download fully digital lessons. In time, local archives will be linked to the aggregator, providing more diverse and regional content.

Closing Session 4, **Dale Peters** (Universität Göttingen) presented DRIVER (Digital Repository Infrastructure Vision for European Research), a project that is centered around making research publications accessible.

She advocated an open access model because without open access, she claimed, information will not reach the people, particularly in developing countries. She saw links to the cultural heritage sector as well: heritage institutions can play an important role in community building and cultural awareness. Obviously, when discussing the distribution of content the following question arises: 'Who pays?'. Peters replied with more questions: 'Who owns the content?' and 'Who has the right to exploit heritage?' and exemplified her argument with the problematic exploitation of religious value objects.

Still, despite the openness and directness which is often associated with an open access model, she pointed to the importance for scholars to remain in control over their work. She proposed a complex model, which takes into consideration a wide range of concerns such as the issue of access, technical requirements, authenticity, research quality assurance and reliable archiving and long-term preservation.

In her argument, she emphasised that access is no longer about ownership to collections, instead it should be considered as a starting point of a value chain. According to Peters, it is time to start redefining informational services and identifying user groups. The focus should not be on content but on use, a reallocation that she reformulated as a shift from *content* to *contact*. Accordingly she pleads for an open access model, in which content distributors charge for services, and not for content. Open access models are about free access to and a worldwide representation of sciences and knowledge. In particular, open access is about collaboration: the interaction of research groups online on the one hand, the way in which we allow people to analyse data and to be able to disseminate and share information on the other hand.