



A JOINT SOLUTION TO MANAGING CULTURAL DIGITAL ASSETS

**EMII/mda Consultation Meeting
Starr Auditorium
Tate Modern – Level 2
Friday, 20th June 2003**

**Open discussion – Facilitator: Louise Smith
Minutes – Effie Patsatzi**

Louise Smith announced that the aim of the open discussion is to specify the requirements for the management of digital assets and invited the participants to get involved in group work to answer the following questions:

1. Would this project be useful to you, why?
2. Do you know of any initiatives, which would have a bearing on this project?

1st group:

Felicity Cobbing – Palestine Exploration Fund
Sam Ractliffe – Museum of London
Darya Feuerstein – Museum of London

The group stated that they would like to know more about solid guidelines and get usable information as well as sound advice. None of the members of the group were specialists in the area.

Initiatives

- NOF initiative
- Moving Here Project
- BAPLA – British Association of Picture Libraries and Agencies

2nd group:

Jo Matthews – Tate Enterprises Ltd
Janis Jefferies – Goldsmiths College

Jo Matthews explained that EMII's work would be useful because:

- It would avoid repetition of efforts
- Resources could be saved
- The group's projects are looking for similar specific information

The group also suggested that it would be useful to create a tick box system, to ensure that all aspects of the project and the end-users have been consulted in the process.

The speaker stated her personal interest in the commercial exploitation of digital resources and clarified the two different categories of users:

- a) Commercial users - justify to charge

- b) The tax payers entitled 'to have something for free'.

Janis Jefferies spoke about artists who work in a digital form, and agreed that the tick box system of criteria would be useful. She also expressed that providing the framework for education is one thing but looking for other services like commercial exploration is equally important. There can be different content providers like:

- a) Content providers in education
- b) Content providers from museum public services

Louise Smith summarising the group's comments mentioned that there are two issues to be taken into account:

- a) Different user profiles (who is using a resource)
- b) Different profiles on who's providing that content.

3rd group

Angela Murphy – Science Museum

Ann Borda – Science Museum

Ela Ginalska – Science Museum

Angela Murphy expressed that the work of EMII should be relevant not only to images but also to textual resources like storylines, narratives and the design arrangement to enable staff to have reference to common sets of principles.

Angela Murphy mentioned that standards are in use internally, at an institutional level and added that cascading the knowledge can be difficult. EMII's work can help to re purpose assets and to cascade knowledge.

The documentation and the archiving of all related information is important as there is a chain from acquisition to dissemination but there are some brakes in the chain and EMII's work can be helpful.

The group commented that there is some tension between the curatorial and the commercial wings. Common standards and policies can help to defuse this tension and ensure working towards common goals.

Initiatives

- MCG (Museums and Galleries Copyright Group)
- JISC
- CLA (Copyright Licensing Agency)
- INDECS
- NOF
- GISC
- UKOLN
- BUFC (British Universities Film and Video Council)

4th group

Naomi Korn – Bridgeman Art Library

Peter Sturley – National Railway Museum

Harriet Bridgeman – Bridgeman Art Library

Naomi Korn reported that collections have to work with different standards, which brings up difficulties. She added that a digital asset can be the result rather than the beginning of the process and thoughts need to be made before a work is accessioned. A digital asset can be used:

- a) Internally - within an organisation
- b) Externally - commercial use
- c) Can be given to another organisation

Naomi Korn added that not only there is lack of common standards but also lack of knowledge.

A framework (that could be a tick box system) would provide an indication of what is expected to be done.

Work should be directed towards smaller institutions where often there is lack of manpower and resources.

Finally, Naomi Korn stated that both the Railway museum and the Bridgeman Art Library are interested in participating in EMII's work.

5th group

Simon Tanner - University of Hertfordshire

Sofia Handaka – Benaki Museum - Greece

David Inglis – Moving Here Project – National Archives

The speaker stated the group's interest within the area of management rights and also within revenue related aspects of museum activities and added the following points:

Art museums are changing their policies, values and aspirations.

There is a need to take into account the fact that digital images cost to create.

Most revenue may come from small percentage of images.

Initiatives

- The Rome agreement, which enables museums across Europe to share resources.
- AMICO which merged with Getty project.
- ArtSTOR Project

6th group

David Bownes – London's Transport Museum

David Ellis - London's Transport Museum

Anna Rotondaro - London's Transport Museum

Tony Harris – Government Art Collection

The speaker suggested the need to address the following questions:

Why should we digitise?

How is it useful?

How extensive should it be?

The London Transport Museum would be very interested in EMII's work as this would contribute to the increase of access to its collections and also would improve collections management and conservation practice within the museum.

Initiatives

- NOF

7th group

Ann Chumbley – Sheffield Galleries & Museums Trust

Catherine Clement – Tate Britain

Kate Parsons – Tate Britain

Ann Chumbley reported that on the basis of her work experience (moved from a big museum to a smaller organisation) she has spotted a big difference in the way that a small organisation works.

The provision of guidelines is a very good idea for small museums (especially where there is no information manager).

Ann Chumbley added that acquisition agreements do not cover everything about digital assets.

Smaller museums struggle to reach the standards even if registered so, there are some reservations for smaller institutions. Therefore, guidelines would be preferable not a standard.

8th group

Alan Seal – Victoria and Albert Museum

Naomi Allen – Guildhall Art Gallery

Amy Dickson – Dulwich Picture Gallery

Alan Seal, has suggested that in the area of copyright, EMII should deliver:

A. Standards and procedures:

1. How to identify Copyright holders?
2. When to give up?
3. When is it legally valid to give up?
4. To produce a framework for agreement with museums
5. To take into account smaller museums and galleries
6. Provide data standards, a framework for recording and tracking copyright in copyright databases.
7. Create a copyright point of legal advice. However, EMII needs to check national variations for copyright
8. Small claims court for dealing where copyright is bridged without going to full legal process

B. Products

1. Copyright holders system e.g. a distributed database
2. Standards agreement with artists' copyright societies
3. Standards license agreements

Alan Seal added that variations exist but the provision of the above can assist in supplying the cultural sector with legal confidence.

Initiatives

- Bridgeman
- AMICO
- EC projects

9th group

Rob Dyer – Copyright Licensing Agency

Julia Hardiman – British Library

Sarah Saunders – Consultant

The speaker stated that the group is interested in EMII's work and suggested that a template to work on and guidelines on licensing use (that represent artists authors and publishers) would be very useful.

The speaker also made the following remarks:

Museums need to be more in touch and informed with the commercial sector.
There are many academic projects, which don't reach out to the community.
Digital licensing requires all stakeholders working together.
Flexibility is required in the cultural Heritage sector.

Initiatives

- Image Network run by the university of Westminster
- BUFEC
- The Digital Object Identifier European initiative (DOI)

10th group

Jeremy Rees – IVAIN

Fiona Marshall – EMLLAC

Martin Donnelly – University of Glasgow

Jeremy Rees stated that the group is interested in EMII's work and commented on the fact that projects have to go through a process of 'reinventing the wheel'.

Initiatives

- Memorandum of understanding – launched by the EC in 1997, the report includes a sub-report on ownership and protection on copyright
- Registrars committee in America – reproduction information network with objectives similar to those of EMII
- INDECS – has a list of known projects so that we don't start from scratch

11th group

Christina McGregor – St Paul's Cathedral

Paulo Costa – Instituto Português de Museus

Janice Mullin – Imperial War Museum

Christina explained that the group had nothing in particular to add and agreed that there is a need for better management of digital assets.

Initiatives

- Research Libraries Group Cultural Materials Initiative

12th group

Erminia Sciacchitano – MINERVA - Italy

Muriel Foulonneau – Relais Culture Europe - France

David Dawson – Resource

Erminia Sciacchitano confirmed that it is a good idea for EMII to pursue this project.

Initiatives

- MINERVA
- TRADEX project aiming to implement a Digital Rights Management model validated as CEN standard (Comité Européen de Normalisation)
- Italian digital culture project
- A working group at a national level in Italy
- Planning to set up an international group under MINERVA

13th group

Eleanor Heron – National Maritime Museum
Aileen O’Riordan - National Maritime Museum
Anna Eavis – English Heritage NMR

Eleanor Heron mentioned that there is lack of knowledge about ways images can be used and inconsistency in standards and service within museums and galleries caused by:

- a) Technology moving fast
- b) Definition/terminology dictionary of possible use types and means of supplying digital images

Eleanor Heron also addressed the question of how museums should supply images to the customers.

Initiatives

- IT businesses with project on Digital Assets Management (NMM is in touch with the TRIM company)

14th group

Tom Morgan – National Portrait Gallery
Damon McCollin-Moore – National Museum of Photography
Belinda Ross – National Gallery Picture Library

Tom Morgan referred to the policy deficit in the sector and the lack of expertise in strategic level and also to the differences in practice across Europe.

Initiatives

- GISC
- TASI (provides with information guidelines)
- MCG
- MCG and the NMDC (lobbying for educational issues in museums and galleries)
- WATCH (list of copyright sources)

15th group

Alison Perrett
Stephen Mellor – Tate Modern
Janice Baker – Curator (Australia)

Alison Perrett spoke about collaborative projects and made a reference to the use of standards, financial agreements and the digitisation process as well as mentioned that there are differences in copyright legislation within Europe.

16th group

Wendy Sudbury – Cambridge Management Group
Edwina Mulvany – National Galleries of Ireland
Margo de Groot – MK5060

Wendy Sudbury expressed that this project is broader than just copyright and can be seen as the digital equivalent of SPECTRUM. As mda in its early days was encouraging the museum world not just to collect the object but also the info with

them, in the same way EMII-DCF now suggests: don't just acquire digital assets you also need to:

- Document
- Manage
- Supply
- Conserve
- Preserve digital assets
- Use the life cycle approach for: acquiring, using, storing, re-purposing

Wendy Sudbury referred to procedures and units of information needed to be catalogued for documentation. The speaker also referred to the need for a common lobbying in museums' approach.

Another suggestion was made about the use of a title form including things that should be captured upfront.

Wendy Sudbury mentioned that the TV example demonstrates that this is not just about museums managing assets but it is about people dealing with broadcast and it is important to have the user's focus (not only the provider's focus). She also added that museum objects are not necessarily the only focus, we need to think broader, all kinds of digital assets such as videos, music, text etc.

17th group

Claire Sussums – Tate

Frances Lloyd-Baynes – Victoria and Albert Museum

Lucy Norris – UCL

This group stressed the need for common code of practise through the use of agreements, which would allow museums to lend free to each other.

18th group

Peter Wienand – Farrer & co

James Stevenson – Victoria and Albert Museum

Bernice Morton – mda

Peter Wienand expressed that the work EMII-DCF would be useful for:

Management Requirements

He suggested that EMII should create practical tools to endorse everything like:

- a) Standards agreements
- b) Collective licensing
- c) Glossaries, terminology

The speaker referred to the Museum Copyright Group, which is currently working with the help of Resource on a feasibility study on license use for online users of heritage assets (not just visual assets, technical also e.g. sound recording).

Legal/financial issues

- Digital rights management systems
- Copy protection systems
- Licensing digital material

The speaker stressed that right holders are going to demand that these systems are employed.

Professional aspects

Peter Wienand argued that there are many Content Management Systems available and many technical issues have been addressed but what would be useful for the sector is an open standard for Cultural Heritage assets management, signed by all platform providers.

Initiatives

- Arts research libraries information service

19th group

Mike Coyne – System Simulation Ltd

Michael Spearman – The Multimedia Team

Bert Degenhart Drenth – Adlib Information Systems

Mike Coyne agreed that the EMII-DCF project is very useful and commented that from the suppliers' point of view it is helpful to have a common platform to work. He added that there is a need to have implicit models (not to use the Photo library model), but look broader than that. The speaker referred to the SCRAN Project as an example.