Encouraging Digital Access to Culture
Foreword

It is interesting to reflect on the pace of change over the past 10 years. In the year 2000, not every museum or gallery had its own website. Now, a recently published list of the top 10 museum websites across the world includes four from the UK. Ten years ago, not all public libraries offered internet access. The £120m Lottery investment in the People’s Network changed that – now all do and, in the vast majority of cases, access is free. Who could have predicted that the British Library would forge a deal with an online bookseller to make available 65,000 largely out-of-print 19th century titles? Or that the Royal Opera House and the National Theatre would show live screenings in cinemas?

But there is a real gap between those institutions who do fantastically well and others who are finding it difficult to catch up. Arts Council England recently published some research which showed that, amongst arts institutions, the vast majority used websites mainly to transmit information about their physical programme. Only a small minority were yet using the web to offer their audiences an interactive experience, for example by giving them the freedom to take digital content and use it to produce and share their own cultural works.

I am not pretending that we can close that gap overnight. The intellectual property rights of the artist must be adequately protected. Without creative genius being nurtured and allowed to flourish, there can be no creative content – shared or otherwise. Nor am I suggesting there aren’t costs or risks to consider. But we’ve already put around £200m into digitisation projects of one kind or another so it’s not as though we’re starting from year zero.

And by getting this right, we will also be playing a major part in driving up digital participation. In March 2010, Government published our National Digital Participation Plan. Our aim is to get another 7.5 million people using the internet by 2014. The Consortium for the Promotion of Digital Participation – many of whose members are involved in using culture to get more people online – will play a leading role in taking forward this work.

Our goal must be to use digital media to encourage new audiences to delight in the richness of our arts and culture – and to enrich and deepen the experiences of those who are hungry for more.

To help us do that, I am grateful to Jonathan Drori whose analysis and findings inform the advice set out in this document. Jonathan has consulted widely with the sector in drafting this advice and has also drawn from his own experience – amongst other things, he led Culture Online for my Department, which in its relatively short life picked up 28 major awards, including four BAFTAs.

I am grateful also to all those who attended and contributed to the two incredibly instructive seminars I hosted – in October last year and March this year. And I hope that others will offer to host occasions such as these for sharing ideas and forming new partnerships.

In the spirit of the web, this is an interactive process and, I hope, this is just the start of the conversation.

Rt Hon Margaret Hodge MBE MP
Minister for Culture & Tourism
March 2010
Background

We have reached a point where digital media are essential elements of modern life. This means that all of us providing services to the public must shift our thinking away from virtual engagement as an extra service which might be offered — and instead recognise the internet as part of the core offering that people increasingly expect to find.

The Digital Britain Report is the Government’s strategic vision for ensuring the UK’s place at the forefront of innovation, investment and quality in the global digital economy.

It sets out our commitment to ensure that people have the capabilities and skills to flourish in the digital economy, and that all can participate in digital society. It also introduces policies to maximise the social and economic benefits from digital technologies.

Arts and cultural organisations have a vital part to play in making this happen. Over the past 10 years, museums, galleries, archives, libraries, film, performing and visual arts organisations have experimented with, and developed, new ways of using digital technology to reach out to new audiences. The best of these have blazed a trail demonstrating the power of the internet and online media to change radically the way arts and cultural institutions communicate with, and respond to, their audiences.

The benefits

The benefits to the public are clear. Access to rich, new cultural content to inform, educate and entertain at the minimum — and opportunities to engage, re-interpret and create provided for the more inventive.

There are also opportunities for businesses. Making cultural assets more digitally accessible should create increased opportunities for the creative economy. But there are also business benefits to arts and cultural institutions themselves. As institutional knowledge and familiarity with the digital landscape increase, so too does confidence to engage with partners and experiment with new business models and ways of working.

The extent of the challenge and the opportunity

For all that progress has been made, there still exists a digital divide in society. While for many, internet use is a basic life skill, over 15 million adults in the UK still do not use the internet and at present around 40 per cent of homes in the UK do not have broadband.

Those excluded tend to be from lower socio-economic groups, older people and people with disabilities. 19 per cent of most digitally-excluded people are families with children.

There is evidence that those not already online are unconvinced there is any reason for them to be so. Many of our cultural institutions are leading the way in getting people online, for example through taking an active role in the consortium for the Promotion of Digital Participation.

Government itself is demonstrating its commitment to open up its assets for broader use. Advised by Sir Tim Berners-Lee and Professor Nigel Shadbolt and others, we recently launched http://data.gov.uk, the aim of which is to increase the accessibility of Government data for use by those with the skills and abilities to come up with creative and exciting new uses for them.

New legislation proposed in the Digital Economy Bill will also make it easier for use to be made of orphan works, whilst still providing protection for the copyright owner should they later come forward or be traced.

So we have arrived at a point where the most forwarding-looking arts and cultural institutions are finding ever new ways to engage with an increasingly digitally sophisticated audience. At the same time, there are many who have not yet moved from using the internet as a means to transmit information which might formerly have been produced in traditional print form.
We want to encourage and support all institutions to develop new ways of using emerging technologies to share digital content and find new ways to engage with wider audiences.

To that end, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport has commissioned Jonathan Drori to draw on his own experience and to consult with the sector on what exactly the challenges and opportunities are. This document sets out Jonathan’s findings and recommendations across a number of key areas. It is intended as best practice advice for the sector, which we hope will act as a stimulus and a catalyst for change.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport
March 2010

Digital Participation

There is a shared vision and strategy across Whitehall for better digital engagement.

The Government has set a target of 60 per cent reduction in the 12.5 million people who are not online in the UK. The target underpins a new drive to reduce the digital divide as set out in the Government’s National Digital Participation Plan, published on 2 March 2010.

The Plan has been developed with a significant contribution from the Digital Participation Consortium whose 60 members including Ofcom, Google, BBC, Sky, UK Online Centres and Age UK, are working collaboratively to help meet the Government target and promote the importance of being online across the UK.

The National Plan for Digital Participation, supported by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) can be found at:

www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/corporate/docs/p/plan-digital-participation.pdf
Introduction

Digital media projects and services require organisations to master and orchestrate many new skills, all in the context of rapid change and thorny strategic questions about ownership, branding, control and business models.

The purpose of this paper is to give guidance to decision makers in the cultural sector so that they can accelerate public digital access to our cultural institutions. The aim is to encourage more rapid deployment of digital techniques where they will do good, by engaging more people, raising the quality of experiences, or saving money.

We rightly take pride in the world-class quality and integrity of the work of the UK’s cultural institutions. They have built a tradition of being the guardians of quality, which has gone hand-in-hand with a culture of control. They have had control over their assets, where and how they have been distributed and to whom, and even how they have been described. But the digital revolution is causing rapid changes to the way that content is produced and discovered, distributed and manipulated, sold and shared. Digital technologies fundamentally change the product or experience. They bring with them the expectation of participation and collaboration and they challenge traditional institutional and sector boundaries.

Many organisations are wary of entering into partnerships that might undermine their brands, or which might jeopardise future income, which they see as being threatened by the push to make their assets freely available. Digitisation and the associated activities of storage, manipulation and distribution, can be costly. Enabling large-scale digital access requires new business models and, arguably, changes in approach to aspects of copyright such as orphan works and format-shifting.

There is a place for caution. While digital services may sometimes supplant real world ones – finding a piece of text online rather than visiting a library, for example – in many cases digital services will complement rather than replace. No-one can underestimate the huge value and delight of being in a live audience, seeing the real artefact or just sword-fighting with sticks at a ruined castle. Digital services can complement and enhance such experiences and deliver completely new ones, but they will never be replacements.

Misused, digital technologies indeed offer the means to make embarrassing and wasteful mistakes. But they also offer exciting ways to engage new and existing audiences and to extract better value from scarce resources. They can also enable the public to engage in refreshing new ways with the experts who breathe life into ‘assets’, turning them into experiences – the actors, curators, directors and interpreters.

The new technologies, if managed well, allow small-scale experimentation at low cost and risk, which can be followed by rapid scale-up of the things that work. Digital techniques are already being used to great effect within the sector – indeed a few examples are included here.

There is huge scope to increase digital access and engagement if the will and the imagination are there.

Finally, I thank all those who have shared their expertise and allowed me to test hypotheses derived from my own experience. I welcome further comments.

Jonathan Drori
dcms@jondrori.com
Section 1

Key Findings and Recommendations
Key Findings and Recommendations

Strategy
- Wherever an organisation has rights to material that has been paid for out of the public purse, our goal should be rapidly to make this material available to the public. (page 12)

- All cultural organisations should have an overarching digital strategy that fits the overall strategic purpose of the organisation and clearly fits with its vision and mission. (page 12)

Leadership & Organisational Culture
- There need to be more digitally-aware people on the trustee and management boards of our cultural institutions and among the elected leaders and executives of local authorities, able confidently to give guidance and take decisions on new services and collaborations. (page 14)

- A culture of playful, rapid small-scale experimentation needs to be fostered, complementing the desire for quality and integrity which already exists. Inappropriate governance is often stifling innovation and rapid expansion of digital access. Encouraging digital access means a radically different approach to managing technology from the way that large-scale legacy systems have been managed. Technology needs to be better integrated into creative processes. (page 22)

Mindset: Control and Credit
- There needs to be a change in organisational attitude to ownership of material and to targets and measures which at present encourage an over-emphasis on control. These targets need to include peer-to-peer sharing, syndication and other kinds of re-use. (page 15)

- Public organisations and indeed the individuals within them frequently compete for credit and limelight. There would be a greater number of worthwhile partnerships if organisations and individuals were more able to waive, share, or at least pre-allocate the credit and limelight that a joint project might bring. The role of Government is important, as it is from Government that credit is often sought. A proactive mandate for collaboration across all Government departments and agencies would help. (page 17)

- Rather than always attempting to bring audiences to one monolithic site, assets should be made available, for example, via social networks, other institutions and media organisations. The means by which public sector funders assess cultural organisations need to change to encourage sharing. (pages 15 and 16)
Business Models

- There is over-optimism about possible future financial value as opposed to present public value. Organisations are overly concerned about detracting from commercial sales when making more material freely available would promote the development of valuable services and may even increase interest and income. Further thought should be given to measures of ‘present public value’. (page 26)

- A useful business model is to allow others freely to use the contents of organisations’ databases on condition that any subsequent revenue is shared (subject to good faith negotiation) and that there is no reputational damage. While organisations might be expected to make material freely available for personal use, they may understandably wish to share in any commercial revenue. (page 26)

- There is demand for a simple rate-card/licence for those wanting to commercialise certain Crown copyright assets. This might stimulate the wider use of the content, and provide a transparent revenue flow back to Government.

Rights

- Organisations will need to choose whether to allow users just to view and to forward to others, or whether they should be able to ‘mix and mash’ as well. Creative Commons provides one possible model for providing permissions by enabling the rights holder to choose for, example, between ‘always credit’ or ‘repurposing allowed’. (page 30)

Digitisation

- The focus needs to shift from digitisation projects as an objective (e.g. our aim is to digitise ‘X’ per cent of our collection) to a focus on getting existing assets into the public domain, gaining audience reach and then strategically identifying gaps. (page 36)

Across the sector

- The sector needs a simple and routine method for encouraging innovative ideas to reach the first stage of approval. New projects and services need someone to champion, develop and lead them, or they won’t happen. Often, this resource can’t be justified until a project is properly defined, with a business case, but that can’t be done without someone’s effort. Catch 22. (page 18)

Mobile/ location-based services are likely to be so important to the sector that they may warrant a special interest group. (page 41)

There’s huge scope to share market data, analysis and insights across the sector and to co-commission market-research that will be useful to all. (page 34)

There may be scope for a sector-wide digital steering ‘network’, so long as this is inclusive and designed to complement rather than replace already existing activities.
Section 2

Organisational Strategy and Leadership
In order to take good decisions and make the most of new techniques, there are aspects of organisational strategy, leadership and culture that need to be in place. What follows are clearly not the only things that matter. Obvious factors such as creativity, artistic and curatorial excellence, financial control, good governance and sound management are important too. The factors mentioned here are the ones that are most likely to inhibit or encourage a step-change in digital access and where there are often problems to be addressed.
a. Strategy

Those who set organisational strategy need to be aware of context. First, there is a strong political will to make assets available and thereby increase public engagement. Second, there is increasing public expectation that they will be able to access, redistribute and even manipulate assets, and contribute comments and material themselves.

Not all cultural organisations have an overarching digital strategy that fits the overall strategic purpose of the organisation and clearly fits with the vision and mission. Given the pace of change, trustee and executive boards, which will need to set or agree digital strategy, must be prepared to revisit the subject frequently.

Boards need a strategic view of what assets should be digitised and how such materials are likely to be used. Frequently, these decisions are made tactically, on the basis of which parts of a collection a particular donor or fund will pay to digitise, rather than strategically.

Too often, digital activities are seen either as an add-on, or something that will compete with or even undermine existing services. Digital techniques have a role to play in informing, amplifying, supporting and developing an organisation’s non-digital activities – the things they have been doing successfully for years, their performances and exhibitions, outreach work, visitor programmes etc.

Our cultural institutions are justifiably proud of the quality and integrity of their work. They have built a tradition over many years of being the guardians of quality. They have had control over their assets, where and how they have been distributed and even how they have been described.

The huge and rapid step-change in digital access for the public that is required implies relinquishing tight control over the form and context of every use, and allowing assets to be made available via suitable technical interfaces. The controls on use should be kept to an absolute minimum (e.g. not bringing the institution into disrepute and agreeing to a revenue share (subject to good faith negotiation) if someone makes money.)

A key area for boards to debate is that of ownership, branding and credit. Within the political context they need to define some general principles of what will be given away for free (and under what kind of licence) and what may be charged for. They need to consider how and by whom the organisation and the individuals within it wish to be credited for its activities, while realising that many organisations will need to relax some control.
At a sector level, common approaches to digital policy and strategy across organisations would be useful, for example, in informing the way that they might approach negotiations with large commercial companies or how organisations should be credited for their contribution. The ‘sector’ in this context needs to be seen more widely than just ‘museums and galleries’, or just ‘performing arts’. The key to unlocking digital opportunities lies in closer working relationships not only between all the DCMS bodies but also those associated with other government departments – in particular tourism and education.

York Art Gallery

Allowing members of the public to have greater control and enabling them to add value for each other implies a cultural shift. The biggest step was to allow public participation, in this case in a very non-technological way – the public were invited to chalk comments around paintings. Having made this change in mindset, allowing participation and comment in an online environment is very much more straightforward.

www.yorkartgallery.org.uk

“Make it easy and enticing for other individuals and organisations to use your data.”
Derek Sivers, Trustee, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC
b. Leadership

For there to be a step-change in public digital access, some trustee and senior management boards will need to acquire new expertise, embrace different mindsets and consider structural issues within their organisations.

i. Expertise

There is a strong perception among the contributors to this paper that the leadership of local authorities and the boards of governors and trustees do not contain enough people who feel confident debating and taking decisions about digital strategy and policy. Trustees, recruited for their seniority and wisdom, are seen as being less likely to be digital natives.

“It’s really easy to get bamboozled by people offering you the latest thing. Board members need enough practical knowledge to ask sensible questions.”

Claire Harcup, Executive Producer

Having more people with insight into digital opportunities would reduce the risk of boards rejecting worthwhile projects or failing to encourage management to consider new digital methods. It would also reduce the risk of ill-considered digital strategy being adopted.

At executive board level, there needs to be some hard-knowledge in addition to the specific expertise expected of a CIO or CTO on the board. In this context, it is helpful to distinguish between knowledge of procurement and management of conventional ‘IT Systems’ (HR, Finance etc) which have some of the attributes of utilities, and ‘Technology’, which is more agile and, therefore prone to small-scale failure.

There is a burgeoning community of digital professionals which is relatively well-networked. However, a common complaint is that those people often find it hard to make themselves heard and understood by senior management and trustees. This frequent lack of critical-mass of expertise at board level sometimes manifests itself as an understandable lack of confidence in delegation:

“The Board needs the expertise to know what they should actually be concerned about and then allow people to get on with it. They need to remove obstacles rather than put them in place. They should foster innovation with technology and small-scale experimentation ...release time for this and promote ways that staff can learn quickly from others.”

Senior manager of a national NDPB on board engagement with digital projects

Individual and Organisational Learning

How can leaders and general managers acquire the skills they need? Learning from others’ experience is one obvious route. Good work needs to be shared more widely and in different fora. Remember though, that human beings learn especially well from ‘mistakes’. Making mistakes and correcting them are key processes in personal and organisational learning but need to happen in an atmosphere of trust. Many do not wish to share their experiences for fear of bad publicity or reputational damage.

Every trustee and senior manager should be a member of a small network of people whom they trust, people who can call each other for recommendations of techniques, or with whom they can test ideas. Some groups might meet every month or two for a working lunch, perhaps with a guest speaker. It is important that these do not just ‘preach to the converted’. New people should be drawn in to such groups on the understanding of trust and confidentiality and must include trustees and executives, as well as those who actually lead and build projects. To share ‘failures’ as well as successes and to be open about one’s strategy are all-important.
ii. Mindset
Relaxing Control

The organisational mindset is currently biased towards creating content and services, drawing audiences to them, controlling how assets are then used and maximising the recognition the organisation receives for doing so.

Some of this comes from understandable attitudes towards quality and integrity. From a pure rights point of view, allowing re-use of most out-of-copyright material should be relatively straightforward. Use or manipulation of other assets may be restricted by moral rights. But issues of integrity could affect all material and will need to be considered. (The manipulation of documents to ‘rewrite’ history is a risk here.) The BBC has for many years enabled owners of websites to use their headlines but have laid down conditions about branding, editorial interference and even layout.

Organisations need to relax their tight grip on content and services, for example, by making data more available, and understanding that other bodies, and indeed the public, will be able to contribute significantly with their own useful insights and expertise.

There are also worries about giving away something of value for which a charge could be made in future, but this mindset needs to shift if we are to achieve the desired step-change in access. The shift is towards sharing rather than owning, with the default assumption that assets should be made available, unless there’s a particular reason not to.

The public can be given access to material in a variety of ways. Traditional, carefully authored experiences may be closely controlled and branded. But assets that are made available for others to share, or possibly even to manipulate and re-distribute can be offered with much looser control. In particular, the contents of institutional databases should be made available via technical interfaces, along with licences that anyone can understand and readily accept. This will lead to more experimentation and more cross-sector experiments from unexpected quarters. Organisations that hold assets should not be thinking that they have to, or should, do it all by themselves or even with the obvious partners.

“Organisations must understand the need to move away from being monolithic destinations and away from the mindset of control, of pulling people in to one place. There needs to be less emphasis on destination sites and more on getting to where people are already engaged. They have to move on from brute-force content creation.”

Nick Poole, Collections Trust

“Too few institutions have cottoned on that the world has changed... The old order was sit back and appreciate. The new order is, build communities and help them create their own content.”

Spencer Hyman, Digital Entrepreneur

“Many cultural organisations have become guardians of the art and the artefact, confident in the status of expert. However the internet is making the exchange of knowledge increasingly fluid and challenging the basis for that confidence. We need to embrace this and journey into co-authorship of new meaning in a world where expert and enthusiast meet and debate as peers. The opportunity is to do things with people in an economy of meaning, not for people in an economy of money.”

Dick Penny, Director, Watershed Media Centre, Bristol
Mindset is hard to shift because it is part of organisational culture. Some will need more help and encouragement than others.

Sharing expertise
i. Our cultural organisations are remarkable repositories of expertise. There are many new opportunities for curators, keepers, artists, actors and commissioners to share their insights with each other and with the public. These include simple email newsletters, contribution to public fora and the more compelling (but time-consuming) social media applications. All of these are worth investigating. Such activities are frequently highly valued by the public, give greater transparency to the workings of our institutions and can provide valuable feedback on what people are interested in and want to know more about.

ii. Institutions are not the only repositories of creative talent. Given the assets and rights to use them, the public and the creative sector as a whole can be a fountain of creativity and innovation. The many thousands of ‘Apps’ that have been created for various mobile platforms are proof of this.

iii. The commercial sector has been exploring business models and applications, and in so doing has developed a wealth of expertise in interpretation of copyright law and testing the limits of technology. There is further scope for both ‘sides’ to learn a great deal from each other, ideally in an environment where nobody is trying to pitch or sell.

Present public value vs. future commercial revenue
At a time of financial uncertainty, it is understandable that organisations should be concerned about giving assets away for which they may later be able to charge. There is a growing body of public opinion which expects to have greater access to assets, which are publicly owned. There is also the risk that, given the pace of change, withholding something of definite and certain value from the public now will not ultimately lead to realisation of the supposed value of that asset in future.

Further thought should be given to sensible measures of ‘present public value’, probably by the DCMS in conjunction with the sector.

Relationships with performers and artists
Creators – authors, actors, artists, dancers and musicians – will have views on copyright and the integrity of their works in connection with new digital services that need to be understood and taken into consideration. The interface between live performance and the digital domain requires particular thought to ensure that relationships between performers and their audiences remain strong.

“It could be made a more frequent condition of funding that organisations share what they’ve got with as many people as possible.”
Tony Hall, Royal Opera House

“People are over-optimistic about future commercial value and not excited enough about present public value.”
Tony Hall, Royal Opera House (and echoed by many others)

“It is amazing what you can accomplish if you do not care who gets the credit.”
Harry S. Truman

“Too many are concerned with their share of the pie – not the overall size of the pie.”
Spencer Hyman, Digital Entrepreneur (and echoed by many others)
Credit and Limelight

For many public bodies and the individuals within them, the credit they get from Government, local authorities and peers together with the public limelight they receive, are key measures of success. This frequently makes for difficult partnerships, particularly where several organisations see themselves as being in competition for the same sources of funding or approval. Collaboration is often harder than it need be because the competition for money and credit from the public, from funding bodies or from Government, are seen as a zero-sum game.

Though it is not often publicly admitted, this attitude makes it harder for bodies in the same sector to collaborate and is an extra barrier to many projects that would lead to better digital access.

Organisations, led by their trustee and executive boards, need to develop a new ‘ego-lite’ approach to collaboration where they are willing to share organisational and individual credit and discuss in advance how they intend to do so.
iii. Structural Issues
There are several structural issues that organisations need to consider, both internally and in the way that they deal with external organisations.

Roles
Much of the sector is traditionally quite hierarchical. New media developments undermine hierarchy and roles often become blurred.

It is normal for cultural sector organisations and government agencies to have different departments for their various activities e.g. education, marketing, curation, finance, strategy. The challenge and indeed the opportunity with digital services is that they cut across all departments, often forcing change by fundamentally influencing the way those departments work.

Digital services are often about innovation which tends to happen at boundaries. Digital access projects thrive within integrated groups, multi-disciplinary teams from across an organisation, or across the sector and possibly involving both commercial and other public bodies.

It is worth trying new combinations and helping people to work in new ways.

The digital world is a networked world. Our institutions should further develop a culture of collaboration, particularly across traditional boundaries, for example between different parts of the sector, between different sectors and between local and national bodies.

Catch 22
New projects and services need someone to champion, develop and lead them, or they won’t happen. Often, this resource can’t be justified until a project is properly defined, with a business case, but that can't be done without someone’s effort.

Small amounts of development funding or effort are often needed to define a project or service, the business model, user-experience etc. Some parts of the creative industries do this well, for example, when developing new plays or television formats. We need to do this routinely for digital services and projects and indeed new ways of making data available to others.

“Lack of vision is a problem but even when there is a vision, there aren’t enough ways for that to permeate an organisation – how to capture ideas and make them happen?”
Mark O’Neill, CIO, DCMS

“The hardest thing is to get people always to think about connections. Their first thought should be, ‘with whom can this work better’, ‘who would have an interest in making this happen?’”
Mark O’Neill, CIO, DCMS
Partnerships
There is clearly scope for new partnerships, especially between large organisations that might not normally work together (e.g. across or outside the sector) and between large and small organisations. For these to flourish, potential partners need to be clear and honest with each other at the outset about their reasons for engaging in a particular project or initiative. In particular, all partners need to be clear about precisely how they wish to use the partnership to increase their:

- Audience Reach
- Revenue
- Efficiency
- Organisational Influence/Reputation
- Personal Influence/Reputation

(It is natural for human beings to want credit for what they do. It is a sign of a trusting partnership if participants can be honest at the outset if personal or organisational credit are factors and how they expect these to be dealt with).

New developments involving several organisations are especially difficult, as there will be an added complication about who should lead it, and of course who should be seen to lead it.

Freelancers or external contractors could be brought in as a last resort. At least they have the advantage of not being tied to one organisation, but this risks them being managed by a ‘steering group’ with representatives from every partner, all pulling in different ways.

With notable exceptions, there is insufficient collaboration between different parts of the sector, for example, between performing arts, visual arts and museums, libraries and galleries. At the very least there need to be more fora bringing these together, preferably with non-profit organisations from other sectors (e.g. RAF Museum, Parliament, RBG Kew, National Trust, British Council, Tourism bodies).
Section 3

Organisational Culture
Organisational Culture

Increased digital access depends on innovative deployment of technology, new ways of working and novel approaches to issues such as copyright and credit. These are all inextricably linked with organisational culture.

This section deals only with those aspects of organisational culture which are most likely to affect public digital access.
Amiduous
The ambition to make a really significant leap in the scale of public access should pervade the whole organisation.

Technophile
Ambivalent attitudes towards engineering and technology are well documented by the professional bodies and beyond the scope of this paper. Technology in general is ill-understood, too rarely regarded as an integral part of the business, and therefore poorly managed. There is a pervasive lack of understanding about how technologists work, what they can offer, what needs to be specified clearly up-front and what can be decided later or changed easily.

The answer is to create integrated teams involving technologists working alongside other experts. Organisations that innovate best, generally do this.

Unsiloed
Web teams, IT departments, curators, authors, performers and artists all have different working practices. They have different approaches to processes and deadlines, to specification up-front versus flexibility, different use of language and ways of dealing with each other. Digital projects cut across silos and generally require disparate teams to work together. They may need help in doing this, especially when the culture of this disparate group needs to be somewhat different from the pervasive culture of the organisation.

Start with small projects first so people can get used to each other’s curious ways.

Audience-led
Organisations need to foster a pervasive culture of being led by the needs of the public, rather than being constrained by internal structures or prompted by organisational interests or self-promotion. Indeed, the ‘public’ will consist of many different sub-segments, which need to be understood before decisions can be taken about whether and how to serve them.

Given the strength of internal departmental structures and of sub-groups within the cultural sector, stout efforts need to be made to encourage teams from across an organisation to focus on the needs of their audiences. By doing so, they will often realise that an audience may be best served by making assets available to some other organisation.

Agile
The ability to be agile in developing new services does not imply that the organisation itself cannot operate in a stable and consistent way. When it comes to digital development though, there is a fundamentally different approach to the rapid, flexible, incremental and iterative development of new digital services from the old-school specification of very large and expensive systems all in one go. Many organisations have not really understood this.

With digital services, it’s generally better to be 80 per cent right and quick (and ready to improve), rather than 99 per cent right and slow. The trick is to know what kinds of mistakes it’s acceptable to make.

Experimental/Playful
The joy of digital development is that it’s easy and cheap to mount small-scale experiments. Rapidly creating small-scale pilots or even sketched visualisations can be very helpful as this allows everyone quickly to engage and comment. These pilots may be internal, shared with potential collaborators or public.

"Organisations need to be able to play, to engage before committing too much.”
Julie Aldridge, Arts Marketing Association

The mindset needs to shift towards one of continuous innovation, not only in what services are offered to the public, but also the business models and partnerships that deliver them.
“You have to light lots of fires – you don’t know which one will catch. If you’re really innovating, you don’t know for sure exactly what’s going to work. This is hard for organisations that are used to very tight control of quality all of the time. The perception of what constitutes ‘quality’ needs to change to embrace experiences which are experimental or in development.”

Mike Saunders, RBG Kew

Organisations that innovate do more than pay lip-service to encouraging a culture of seeking forgiveness rather than permission. They foster constructive peer review and feedback from like-minded people and ensure that people are encouraged to share their results and ask for help from others. In the case of our cultural institutions, this help should be sought not only from within the organisation, but at the very least from other parts of the public service. The way this presently happens is patchy and siloed. There are also reports of pilots and projects being ‘spun’ as a success in order to keep funders happy. This is damaging in many ways, not least that the vital feedback about what really works and what doesn’t would be withheld from the sector and possibly even from the organisation itself.

The Tate’s 2015 Vision

Some organisations try to build experimentation into everything they do.

The Tate’s 2015 Vision includes the following wishes, which all support the organisation’s moves towards digital access:

**Open:** by being open to new ideas; encouraging debate, exchange and collaboration; and by being more inviting to all people, within and beyond Tate;

**Global:** connecting the UK to the world and the world to the UK through Tate’s programmes and Collection;

**Entrepreneurial:** by being stimulating, cutting-edge and ideas-led.

[www.tate.org.uk/about/ourpriorities](http://www.tate.org.uk/about/ourpriorities)
Section 4

The Building Blocks of Digital Projects and Services
Increasingly, institutions will make their assets available via suitable technical interfaces, in such a way that others can effectively commission and develop services, and engage the public with them. Whoever instigates or develops the services, it is necessary to orchestrate and manage some key areas in an integrated manner.

(Other factors, such as overall marketing and distribution, and prudent financial control, are equally important but these are the areas that apply to digital access in particular.)

Why the emphasis on integration? Nobody would start building a bridge without thinking about what vehicles would travel on it, where it needs to go, why it’s needed in the first place, what it would look like, how much it would cost, from what materials it would be built, and so on. So it is with digital projects. All aspects need to be conceived and managed together. It is worth re-emphasising that digital projects should not be seen as ‘IT’ projects!

Not all these functions need reside in one organisation. Frequently, supplier relationships or partnerships will be necessary with others, for example, to sub-contract technical or design work, or collaborate with a group that already has access to an audience.
Business Matters and Models

N.B. The phrase ‘Business Models’ in this context does not necessarily refer to for-profit activity.

There is a strong consensus that organisations need to be clear about their objectives for a particular project or initiative, which can generally be divided into three areas:

- Revenue (including cost savings)
- Audience Reach
- Reputation (or 'Influence')

Each initiative should focus on only one, or possibly two, of these objectives. This would encourage organisations to think carefully about their business models. For example, would they expect a share of revenue should another organisation begin to sell services based on its assets, or are they fundamentally concerned about increased audience reach?

To publish or withhold?

Despite the political direction and the increased public expectations, cultural institutions have some understandable concerns about making even their out-of-copyright materials freely available. The main worry is about the loss of future potential revenue, and also the costs of digitisation, storage and distribution.

“The reflex of some organisations is to warehouse assets for no particular reason other than that they might be useful or valuable someday.”

Mike Saunders, RBG Kew

There is a widely-held feeling amongst those consulted in writing this guidance that organisations are being over-optimistic about the future value of their assets. At a time of particular financial uncertainty it is understandable that they are reluctant to give away free that which they may charge for in future.

“Organisations can be very naive about over-focusing on cost rather than public value.”

Prof. Angela McFarlane

The potential future financial value needs to be balanced very carefully with the present public value of making material freely available. Better measures of public value probably need to be devised that may include estimates of reputation, reach, impact, enhancement of people’s lives, enrichment and so on.

An emerging model

A successful emerging business model is to use relatively simple technical interfaces, allowing an organisation’s assets that have already been digitised to be made available to all who wish to experiment with them. There are likely to be conditions, generally including some of the following:

- Branding constraints
- Rights restrictions

In some cases, there will be multiple rights holders and the situation will be complex. Elsewhere, the rights position may be very straightforward. Either way, information about rights is very valuable to any potential user.

- Ensuring that the organisation is not brought into disrepute
- Requiring reciprocal web-links
- Sharing revenue
Those organisations or members of the public who wish to use assets for non-commercial activity might be allowed to do so as they please. However, anyone earning revenue must revert to the institution and negotiate a revenue share or reasonable fee. (Commercial companies doing development on material made freely available will want to see a return on that investment, so will be looking for revenue share in proportion to risk and capital outlay.)

- Sharing usage data – online reporting from partners is crucial in encouraging development of technical interfaces and re-use of data.

Through this emerging model, material can get to the public very quickly. It can encourage developers and entrepreneurs to consider both public-service and commercial applications which will be of benefit to the economy, the asset-owning organisation, the commercial company and the public.

Organisations should consider their for-profit and not-for-profit strategies in an integrated way. There’s often a relationship between material made available for free and potential future sales (of, for example, posters, cards, memberships, books) but this link is not well understood by the sector. It is an area that would benefit from wide small-scale experimentation and data-sharing between institutions.

---

The Guardian Open Platform Project

Guardian News and Media has huge databases of content, going back many years. Rather than keeping tight control over all development, they decided to make data available via APIs under clear commercial terms of use governing, for example, future revenue-share and links back to the Guardian.

“There’s no way we could work out all the uses and value in our content on our own. Also, this has seeded our content all over the net in a way we could never have done”

Colin Hughes, Director, Business and Professional, Guardian News and Media

According to Hughes, The Open Platform Project now has about a thousand developers using Guardian content, mostly in the US and UK. This has led to many applications and business models based on the content itself, and has spread word about the organisation’s attitude and capabilities far and wide.

www.guardian.co.uk/open-platform
There is considerable debate about what exactly should be given away for free and what should be charged for. How much of the interpretation, the catalogues, the labels, the assets themselves? Again, small scale experimentation and exchange of learning between institutions are key.

**Enabling the public to add value**
Expert and lay members of the public can enhance institutional content with user-generated material such as photographs, text or votes. The integration of such user-generated material may happen completely separately from any one cultural institution, or it may be something they choose to encourage or even host.

Visitors to Amazon can write critiques and vote on whether those critiques are helpful. They also add value to the community by enabling the system to make recommendations "other people who liked this, also bought this".

**GalaxyZoo** uses members of the public to recognise and categorise galaxies contained within space photographs. This has led to a valuable internationally renowned resource and the discovery of new astronomical objects.
Paying for Digitisation and Distribution

Digitisation and the associated activities of storage, manipulation and distribution are costly. Enabling large-scale digital access requires new business models. A common one is known as ‘free and fee’, or ‘freemium’, where certain elements are given away for free while some features are charged-for.

There are many good examples where the balance of free to fee is widely thought to be well-judged (two of them are below). An example of the balance having been perhaps misjudged is the Domesday Book, which has a poor search facility and could have been so much more usable had it been entirely in the public domain. Hindsight is a wonderful thing.

Perhaps the best known example of mass digitisation in the UK is the National Archives’ project to make census data available, which was accomplished with a commercial partner. Users can access basic census data from 1841 to 1911 free of charge but in order to see greater detail or to print records they need to pay a fee, which is split between the National Archives and the commercial partner.

The British Library has a vast collection, which would require huge sums to digitise. With commercial partners, and at no cost to the public purse, the British Library has digitised from the 19th Century 65,000 titles (23 million pages) of out of copyright books and two million pages of newspapers.

This material is free to British Library users and university and college researchers, and the books are also free to the public via terminals at selected libraries. Otherwise, all the material is available online at a fee and possibly soon by print-on-demand, for which the British Library will receive royalties.

Many institutions use their corporate fund-raising activities to help pay for digitisation and distribution. JISC and Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) both fund such activities on behalf of their higher education audiences. Individual donors occasionally generously fund areas of particular interest to them, though this does lead to a tactical approach to digitisation rather than a strategic one.

Production

The ease with which content can be produced leads to new business models. For example, audio guides used to be produced by production companies and the material jointly owned with the cultural institution. Now, institutions are increasingly able to produce good quality material for themselves, owning all rights to podcasts which can be re-used in many ways. Soon even the guide handsets won’t be needed as visitors increasingly use their own mobile devices.
Sustainable services
Rightly, there is much talk of sustainability though not everything has to be sustainable. A one-off event or project is fine as long as it is planned and acknowledged as such, with a clear indication of value for money measures such as costs per user. If it’s to be a service, the lifetime needs to be specified and how the service will be sustained needs to be thought about up-front. Frequently, this sustainability is the main thing to test in any pilot. A contrast between the public and commercial sectors is that the latter test the sustainability as a crucial matter of course, whereas public services often test the user experience but ignore sustainability issues when piloting.

Copyright & Ownership
[Appendix 1 contains a more detailed discussion of rights.] The Office of Public Sector Information (OPSI) and Creative Commons are both useful sources of help.

Many organisations have asked for leadership on copyright and intellectual property issues. There is confusion about what organisations are allowed, expected or obliged to do. Not everyone shares the view that all should be in the public domain.

In general, assets will be either:
i. Out of copyright or otherwise already owned by the public.

In such cases, images or representations of these assets may be owned by an institution. Public users will need to be given a licence to use them.

ii. Orphan works – where the rights holder is not known

iii. In-copyright works

If we are to bring about a step-change in digital content accessibility, the default situation should be that out-of-copyright material should be made available to the public. Images and representations of such material, owned by public bodies, should be made available so that the public can use them without further referral using a suitable instantly available licence (such as Creative Commons, or similar). Those who wish to use such material for commercial gain may be asked to negotiate a revenue-share.

Sensible efforts should be made to facilitate use of orphan works – works where the copyright owner is not known or cannot be traced after a diligent search. Legislation proposed in the Digital Economy Bill has broad support from the cultural sector and would make it easier for use to be made of this material, while still providing protection for the copyright owner should they later come forward or be traced.

Frequently, assets contain a mixture of rights. For example, different rights in an archived film may be owned by different people or organisations, including the director, composer, musicians and actors. It is important for talent unions to be included in the thinking about business models. That way they’ll be happier to experiment. Participants need to be realistic about potential revenues and understand the trade-off between advances and royalties. Smaller up-front payments can allow a project more chance to fly. Royalty payments can be expensive to administer. In addition, royalties can only be waived or subsequently negotiated by the original holder (performer, composer etc) or someone with the right to represent them. This is a problem when, for example, there are new technical developments which were not foreseen in the original contract.

While one obviously cannot expect all newly commissioned works to be available free to the public, contract negotiations should be held in the context of increasing public access. The public, and indeed commercial companies, will need to understand that works that are in-copyright will have moral rights attached, meaning that modifications and mash-ups (mixing data from different sources to create new services) of some material may be limited and that creators may need to be credited.
Editorial Leadership & Project Management

Editorial leadership and project management are different functions, each given different emphasis by different kinds of people and institutions. The emphasis on project management is often on delivery on-time and on-budget.

The emphasis of editorial leadership is generally on the user experience. The person with this role is empowered to take decisions on behalf of an audience. They may use audience research to do this but it is quite a different way of working from the way that large technology projects have traditionally been managed, where user representatives may be consulted but the project manager often lacks the clout or skill to be able to markedly change or even cancel a project once it is under way.

Given the increasing amount of data that will be made available via suitable technical interfaces, editorial leadership and project management may or may not reside in a cultural institution. These activities may be sub-contracted, and increasingly they will be taken on by members of the public via social networks, or other organisations who have been given access to institutional data.

Good creative projects and services need both editorial leadership and project management. The creative sector often gives this role to someone called a ‘producer’ or ‘executive producer’. The title is not important, but the function is. Their task is to deliver great projects and services on behalf of an audience, on time and on budget. Whatever their background, they are unlikely to be effective if they are required to operate from within a technology area.

Editorial Leadership and Project Management need to be covered and qualified individuals need to be given the authority and environment in which to operate.
Content

Content encompasses not just assets themselves such as text, images, video and sounds but also includes descriptions (size, provenance, rights information), interpretation and crucially, comments and additions by members of the public or other users. Content is also the digital description of any physical venue, including access, opening hours and events, as well as a description of its online resources. Once it is digitised, content becomes data.

It would often be better for audiences if assets were aggregated in ways they would find interesting or relevant. Audiences are very often interested in themes (such as Henry VIII, football, drugs, or opera), rather than in a particular institution. One can be sure that once the data is made available, people will find many interesting new ways to aggregate it.

Culture24 provides links, listings and education resources from thousands of UK museums, galleries, archives and libraries, all in one place. Material is aggregated by topic and theme in response to audience research. In order to reach wider audiences, as well as publishing on its own site, data is beginning to be shared via technical interfaces (APIs) so that other organisations can conveniently use the information.

www.culture24.org.uk
Audience Insight

In addition to the measures of public value already discussed, the sector needs more sophisticated measures of share and audience approval and measures of usage that take into account syndication and re-use of material. Most institutions will by now have migrated from tracking page views to visitor-sessions but measures of appreciation or usefulness are still comparatively rare.

At the moment, there appear to be strong incentives for organisations not to make their material available to others. The key, at least in the short- and medium-term, will be to ensure that data about usage of assets, by partners and via technical interfaces to databases, are shared.

What matters most to the public is that they have access to material. However, organisations need to tell how often and by what kind of people it has been used, and in what context. They will also be concerned about the salience of their own brands. Though this salience is likely to be more important to the organisations themselves than individual members of the public, it is understandable that institutions that are paid for by the public will want to be able to stand out in the public’s mind.

It is often possible to keep assets on an organisation’s own servers but allow them to appear within other people’s web sites, still using technical interfaces to enable intermediaries to build applications. The advantage of this approach is that the owner of the assets can still count the number of times the assets are used – though they’ll be ‘hits’ on their web-server rather than views of one of their own pages.

Frequently audience data and targets are poorly understood at the most senior board and trustee levels.

We can learn from the commercial sector – which has gradually moved to look at three critical metrics:

a. Number of new users (and how fast they grow); not just on organisation’s own website but anywhere
b. Engagement – i.e. time spent, tasks completed, etc.
c. Revenue/Profit per user. This one may be hard – but can certainly be approached from a cost perspective. In the public-service case, we need another measure of public value, possibly cost per user-session or cost per use.
There’s enormous scope to share data, analysis and insights and to co-commission research that will be useful to all. There is no reason why the Non Departmental Public Bodies including the National Museums, the MLA-fostered museums, The Arts Council and English Heritage should not immediately share audience data. Some argue that the BBC, as a public body, should also share (and have access to) pooled public-service market research data. This might even be extended in some cases to involve the charity sector (e.g. The National Trust, RSPB, The Woodland Trust).

“Sharing data would be fabulous. I can imagine a dashboard, benchmarks… this would lead to real sector understanding”

Julie Aldridge, Arts Marketing Association

In addition to the need to pool research itself, we need to devise suitable measurements and means of sharing data about impact, sales/visit, online participation, even what people are talking about.

The Indianapolis Museum of Art in Indiana USA has developed a dashboard that gives an easily understood snapshot of the organisation’s key performance indicators and they have chosen to make this public. Users can easily see the number of visitors, art on loan, hours of conservation work, participation in educational tours, volunteer hours – even interactive maps of membership by zip-code.

www.imamuseum.org
User Experience

User experience should be considered in a holistic way. Rather than thinking of digital services in isolation one should consider how they might be integrated into real-world experiences. In order to do this, one needs a holistic understanding of user-experience.

Most successful digital projects are storyboarding with sketches of user-journeys, enabling people to cluster round and comment. This is a fast, focused method needing no more than pencil and paper and a few heads.

Design & Information Architecture

Information architecture should reflect the needs of the audience. This architecture is unlikely to match the structure of an organisation or a partnership. Inevitably, therefore, new digital services force difficult decisions about roles and responsibilities.
**Auditence Reach**

Whatever the means of marketing and distribution, it is crucially important that these are considered at the outset of any project and managed alongside all other components. This applies to digitisation activities which can only achieve their full potential when people get access to the digital assets.

One of the most important emerging themes is that organisations should enable their content to be manipulated and re-distributed by those who have access to audiences. Limitations are likely to include moral rights and issues of integrity, plus possibly branding and the sharing of usage data.

Some markets and channels such as formal education are already well established – there is an immediate opportunity to expand the amount of cultural content being offered into these.

It may be practical for very large organisations to afford the scale and marketing spend required to have sufficiently salient sites to draw audiences to them. But even they are likely to benefit from making content available for others to use. Smaller organisations, with lower marketing budgets are likely to find that partnerships with larger institutions and at the same time with social media networks, media organisations, online reference tools and peer-to-peer groups will be most effective. The assets they share can be hyperlinked to bring people on a further journey back to the organisation.

Such methods of syndicating and sharing assets imply more sophisticated ways of measuring usage, so that organisations can decide where to put their efforts and resources.
Technology

Data
An enormous quantity of valuable information is held within institutional electronic databases, largely unavailable to the public. These data include music, film, video, text, graphics, and images. There are also ‘metadata’, information about each of these assets, which may include title, rights information, a description, the size or condition of a work, and so on.

There is a consistent call for common ways of tagging and describing assets, the culture sector being seen to have too many ad hoc and proprietary systems. This would clearly be helpful but should not be used as an excuse to withhold data. There is plenty of scope to make material available via programming interfaces and as long as these are described well, it may not matter that the tagging regime varies.

There is however a job to do in matching up different metadata. This is a key to re-use and is often a job that falls between partners.

Metadata standards are difficult. One of the reasons that books, films and music were among the first items to be sold online on a large scale has been the presence of good metadata standards (ISBN, ISMN etc).

Databases and Interfaces
Many institutional databases are already at least partially open to the public. It is, after all, possible to enjoy online many objects from our national collections.

But there are four factors that would make these databases much more valuable:

- Nobody can do anything with data if they don’t know what’s there. The mere existence of databases (a description of the contents, rather than the contents themselves) should be declared and made available to the public as a matter of course. Descriptions of databases and the metadata fields they contain should be public. This is comparatively easy and will enable other public bodies, commercial organisations and members of the public to start thinking about applications for the data.

- The actual data should be made available at the lowest possible cost to the public unless there is an insurmountable reason for not doing so (e.g. work by living artists who withhold permission). Of course, careful thought will need to be given to the business model underpinning digitisation, manipulation and distribution.

- Where practical, metadata, as well as the content data itself should be made public in such a way that other computers can read and manipulate the information. The big opportunity is to make all this data available via APIs, or Application Programming Interfaces, which make it possible for others who have been granted access to take the data and use them in combination with other information, to create entirely new applications.

Imagine standing on Westminster Bridge with a mobile device and being able to see all the works in our public collections that have been painted near that spot, or involved that place, such as Wordsworth’s famous sonnet. Once the databases have been made available, this would be an easy task to programme and provide an enjoyable and educational service that would immediately work across the whole country.

"Any funder should insist that existing datasets and systems are re-used wherever possible – this supports sustainability”

Jane Finnis, Culture24
Creative Commons and W3C are doing relevant work in this area and there are commercial companies also active in the field.

There may be a role for some national datasets of information that are unlikely to change very often and that can be used and re-used in a variety of contexts. Examples include the venue and access data held by Culture24 and Ordnance Survey mapping data.

**Agile Development**

In order to make best use of these databases, the development community needs to know that they exist and needs to know the format of the information and the interfaces (APIs) that have been made available.

> "It was on display in the bottom of a locked filing cabinet stuck in a disused lavatory with a sign on the door saying 'Beware of the Leopard'
>
> The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy, Douglas Adams

APIs have to be understandable and usable, but people need to know about them too. One successful way to spread the word is to mount ‘hack days’, where technologists, developers, business people, users and content experts – anyone with an interest – is invited to a one- or two-day event. It is important to involve people who understand the cultural content (e.g. curators, writers) to make the most of what’s on offer. The hack day might be mounted by an institution, or a sector. The various data and interfaces to them are described and prototype applications are quickly brainstormed and developed to see which ones are worth pursuing.

The output of a successful ‘hack day’ is likely to be a small set of applications that can be readily understood and discussed. It is rare for the code itself to be in a fit state for immediate use without some further development. In addition, these events need to be managed in such a way that while developers have the satisfaction of working with interesting datasets and interfaces, the institution also fulfils its needs in terms of potential audience and usage.

Hack days are social and the feeling of community among developers and ‘culture people’ is important to foster. The human networks formed during these hack days are valuable.

Note that the procurement methods, governance mechanisms, budgets and indeed the whole culture of agile web development are quite different from the traditional large-organisation IT Department. There are now cheap, quick ways of developing experimental systems and scaling them up.

> "We need organisational ambition, combined with plenty of small scale technological experimentation."
> Paula LeDieu, BFI
Many legacy systems have involved previous significant investment. Often, an organisation’s expertise, or that of its traditional consultants, may lie in traditional IT systems. This perpetuates the practice of ponderous large-scale procurement of inflexible systems, designed to be specified in detail at the outset. There are better ways, and the DCMS can give pointers to good sources of independent advice.

**Digitisation**

Different parts of the cultural sector face different technical challenges in making their assets available in electronic databases.

It is easier to digitally photograph a painting, for example, than to digitise a whole film and easier to digitise a film than a live opera. Film and opera have been slower than galleries to digitise, partly because of the nature of the assets and also because the copyright issues are more complex.

With the law as it stands, in-copyright works cannot be digitised without permission. The OPSI has proposed that libraries, archives, museums and galleries should be allowed to ‘format-shift’ their collections (i.e. digitise) to preserve them but they would not be able to make these available to the public if the underlying work is still in copyright without the copyright owner’s permission.

In fact, there is much debate about whether more digitisation is really the priority. There is a definite consensus that widespread digitisation without thought for how the material will be distributed and used should not be a priority for funding. There is a balance between digitisation and access and the balance probably differs across the sector.

The focus needs to shift from digitisation projects as an objective (e.g. our aim is to digitise ‘X’ per cent of our collection) to a focus on getting existing assets into the public domain, gaining audience reach and then strategically identifying gaps.
Common Infrastructure
Within an organisation data can be shared for multiple uses if the central system is set up right. For example, a good collection record with an image can be used for cataloguing, preservation, research, online sale, included in an API for republishing, built into an online exhibition, packaged into a learning resource – all from the same digital record.

Across the sector, there are economies of scope and of scale when organisations band together to use a common platform or infrastructure. This applies equally to game formats, where the underlying engine might be re-used for multiple applications, or to means of distribution.

There is a trade-off between the saving from using a pre-existing platform and the time it takes to do deals. Platform operators therefore need to enter into ‘blanket’ arrangements, so that small organisations without access to expensive lawyers and negotiators can still feel that using the platform or system is worthwhile.

Opus Arte, a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Royal Opera House, was established in 1999 to provide classical music programming on DVD and television. Its present partnership with DigiScreen enables international cinema audiences to watch recorded performances. The platform has already been used by other organisations, including Glyndebourne.

www.opusarte.com

The National Theatre has successfully experimented with NT Live, bringing high-definition live National Theatre performances to digitally enabled cinemas in the UK and around the world. Much effort has gone into making these performances feel like special events for the cinema audiences. This platform could in principle be used for other theatres.

www.nationaltheatre.org.uk/ntlive
New technologies

A detailed discussion of new technologies is beyond the scope of this document but managers should at least understand and have played with the following, which are already affecting the cultural sector:

- Social media, such as Facebook, LinkedIn, MySpace
- Self-publishing, such as Blogger, WordPress, Ning
- Location based services – mobile devices know with great accuracy where they are. This enables navigation and mapping tools, and also services such as Google Latitude which enable users to see where their contacts are on a map.
- Augmented reality – applications that can add an extra layer of meaning by superimposing computer generated images or sounds onto the real world. A popular application is the tool that superimposes a map of the night sky, together with the names of stars and constellations, when the phone is pointed heavenward.
- Image recognition – applications such as Plink and Google Goggles which enable visual search. Point a mobile phone camera at a book and instantly find the price on Amazon and order it. Take a picture of an unknown painting and be taken immediately to web pages that describe the image.
- Audio recognition – applications such as Shazam will recognise most recorded music, offer information about the artist and enable an immediate purchase of the track.
- The wisdom of crowds – applications such as Photosynth can combine the efforts of many photographers to build 3D models of many locations.

When Amazon first started, it had ranks of great book editors who wrote editorial reviews and, more importantly, decided what was displayed on the various pages of the site (cf. what curators choose to display). Now what is displayed on the Amazon website is personalised and automated via “wisdom of crowds”. No more editors deciding who gets home page placement. How long before the same happens to curators in museums?

Collaborative computing tools – Wikipedia is one well known example but anyone can set up shared documents and office tools.

Collaborative filtering – recommendation engines based on other people’s behaviours.

Games – there are opportunities for the public creative sector to work more closely with experts in all of these areas. These individual opportunities are beyond the scope of this paper but take, for example, games.

Katie Pekacar, MLA

It would be helpful for trustees and boards of management to have one-to-one demonstrations of these and other developments, preferably from staff in their own organisations.

“If you look at so many of the battle games that are really popular right now (Call of Duty, Medal of Honour) they’re essentially virtual historical re-enactments. They already have added value content (testimonies of real soldiers, maps, artefacts etc) – why isn’t it museum content? To do that, museums need to create their content in ways that are usable by companies developing these really sophisticated games, but we need both sides to talk first.”

Katie Pekacar, MLA
Section 5

10 Essential Things To Do
10 Essential Things To Do

1. Ensure that you have a digital strategy, in line with the vision and mission of your organisation.

2. Make it easy and enticing for other individuals and organisations to use your data. Allow and encourage others to share, use and re-distribute public content. Celebrate when they add value to it.

3. Remember that innovation happens at boundaries. Put together multi-disciplinary teams from across organisations, the sector and involve commercial and other public sector bodies. Try new combinations.

4. Tame your ego and that of your organisation. Be willing to waive or share credit and discuss in advance how you intend to do so. Take out all public references to Lead Partner.

5. Consider user experience in a holistic way. Don’t think of digital services in isolation but how they might be integrated into real-world experiences. Develop user-journeys to help you consider how digital and real-world experiences will complement each other.

6. Ensure there’s a critical mass of people who are at ease with the digital world among trustees and executives and that the latter isn’t wholly concentrated in the CIO/CTO.

7. Be playful. Encourage rapid experimentation on small scale, whether that’s in-house development or making material available to the public – you don’t have to do it all at once!

8. Remember to integrate technology – it’s not a bolt-on extra.

9. Be user-focused, not driven by management structures or technical ‘solutions’.

10. For each new partnership, be open about how you’re hoping to increase revenue, audience reach or reputation (personal or organisational) and exactly what your expectations are.
Section 6
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Katie Pekacar, MLA
Lynne Brindley, British Library
Mandy Williams, Geffrye Museum
Mark O’Neill, DCMS
Mike Saunders, RBG Kew
Mike Stubbs, FACT
Nick North, Director, Orbis
Nick Poole, Collections Trust
Paul Gerhardt, Archives for Creativity
Paula LeDieu, BFI
Peter Buckingham, UK Film Council
Prof. Angela McFarlane, RBG Kew
Richard Deverell, BBC
Roy Clare, MLA
Sally Luton, Arts Council England
Simon Bell, British Library
Spencer Hyman, Entrepreneur
Steve Rowan, Intellectual Property Office
Tom O’Leary, UK Parliament
Tom Schuller, NIACE
Tony Ageh, BBC Archives
Tony Hall, Royal Opera House
Will Gompertz, Tate/BBC
Xerxes Mazda, British Museum

Thanks to Macmillan publishers and Charlie Campbell, EdVictor Ltd for permission to use the Douglas Adams quote from The HitchHikers Guide to the Galaxy.
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Appendix 1
– A Note on Rights

Terminology
Copyright is described under the umbrella term ‘intellectual property’, along with patents and trademarks.

Copyright is a kind of intellectual property that gives the creator of an original work exclusive rights for a certain time period in relation to that work, including its publication, distribution and adaptation, after which time the work is said to enter the public domain. The copyright for individuals’ works in the EU and US is generally life plus 70 years. Copyright applies to any expressible form of an idea or information that is substantive and discrete and fixed in a medium.

An orphan work is a copyright work where it is difficult or impossible to contact the copyright holder. It may be that the author has never been publicly known because the work was published anonymously or the work may have never been traditionally published at all. Information about the author may have been mislaid. Even if the author is known, there may be no information about who inherited the copyright or now owns it.

Moral rights are rights of creators of copyrighted works that include the right of attribution, the right to have a work published anonymously or pseudonymously, and the right to the ‘integrity of the work’. ‘Preserving the integrity of the work’ prevents the work from being altered or distorted. Anything that might detract from the artist’s relationship with the work even after it leaves the artist’s ownership may bring these moral rights into play. Moral rights are distinct from any economic rights tied to copyrights. Even if an artist has assigned their rights to a work to a third party, they still keep the moral rights to the work.

In most of Europe, it is not possible for authors to assign their moral rights (unlike the copyright itself, which is regarded as an item of property which can be sold, licensed, lent, mortgaged or given like any other property). They can however agree not to enforce them. Such terms are very common in European contracts. Note that Moral rights are held by individuals, not companies.

Database rights protect the structure of a database from being copied without the owner’s consent. Note that this is different from the contents of the database, which will be covered by other rights.

What can Government do to encourage wider access to institutional assets?

1. Out of Copyright Material, e.g. Old master paintings, Greek sculptures, Shakespeare plays

In this case, the institution can choose what to do with images or models of the material. Remember however, that even with works that are out of copyright, there may well be copyright in, for example, photographs of those works. That copyright is likely to be owned by the institution but there are plenty of cases in which individual photographers still have rights. In some circumstances, institutions may find it cheaper and easier to re-take photographs rather than pay or negotiate with rights-holders.

Organisations may fear loss of revenue from their retail operations if they were to make images of their collections readily available for anyone to use, for any purpose. Some may want to make material available on condition that any commercial uses are negotiated and any income is shared. Some institutions may have contracts in place with commercial companies that would be jeopardised by a blanket free publication of material.

For Out of Copyright Material, organisations may have strong views about whether or not they want to share say, high resolution images with the public but at least it is in their power to do so, albeit with some costs attached.
How can Government help to make more of this material available?

- Build desired outcomes into the Funding Agreements.
- Reward organisations that find worthwhile ways of making material available.

2. Orphan Works
There exists a large amount of material in our institutions for which there is no information about who owns copyright.

How can Government help to make more of this material available?
Specifically allow orphan works to be used by educational and cultural institutions (Clause 42 of the Digital Economy Bill).

Possibly set up a fund so that payments can be made in the event of copyright holders coming forward. Such a fund might be set up by a third party.

3. Works that are still in copyright

a. Where the copyright owner agrees to allow use
The copyright owner can spell out exactly what an institution might be allowed, or not allowed to do with a work. Though they might be unlikely to do so, they could also choose to assign copyright to an institution. On top of that, they might agree not to enforce any moral rights they may have. Bear in mind that creative members of the public will want to re-version, and ‘mash-up’ material, so moral rights need careful consideration.

How can Government help to make more of this material available?

Encourage the production and dissemination of model contracts, so that individuals and small institutions can easily do deals with rights holders. These contracts should cover only the things that are most important to Government (e.g. non-commercial/educational use). Creative Commons provides one very useful group of model licensing arrangements. There are others.

Possibly encourage a campaign to persuade rights holders to share, and to thank them publicly for doing so.

b. Where the copyright owner does not agree to use
This is the hardest area for Government or public bodies to influence without major (and probably contentious) changes to EU directives and international treaties. Do 1, 2 and 3a first!

Note that some works may have several rights holders. Much of the BBC television archive, for example, has separate rights owners including actors, musicians, directors, writers, as well as the BBC itself as publisher.
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