

1. Introduction: On Europeana

It has been a long while since the concept and practice of digital archives were emphasized in Japan. In recent years, “national digital archive” is attracting much attention. In this essay, “national digital archive” is defined as an initiative for the formation of portals and platforms that promote improved access and utilization by integrating the information of digital archives preserved and disclosed to the public in a variety of forms by different archive institutions. Please note that they are not digital archives of various cultural resources owned by different archive institutions in the nation aggregated and controlled on the centralized server managed by the nation.

A representative example of such initiative is Europeana in Europe. A number of excellent introductions and explanations are being made available in Japan about Europeana, so my description is kept simple. In 2016, more than 3,500 archive institutions in Europe participate in it, which collects more than 50 million metadata of digital cultural resources and provides collective access. The cultural resources it deals with extends from works possessed by traditional cultural institutes such as museums, libraries and archives, to contemporary cultural archives such as films, TV programs and fashion. As EU makes a *supra*-national presence, calling Europeana (operated by EU) *national* digital archive is not appropriate politically and in terms of fact. Europeana, however, which intends to construct an intensive infrastructure of digital archives based on political and

geographical spheres, is considered a model for building a national digital archive by many nations including Digital Public Library of America (DPLA). Japan is no exception.

One of the structural features of Europeana is that it does not directly cooperate with each archive institution, but emphasizes the role of an organization called “aggregator” organized by each nation, area, field or theme. Aggregators not only collect metadata from participating archive institutions but also work as a promotional base for digital archives offering technical and human support as well as community formation and development of human resources for participating archive institutes. While aggregators are sometimes organized by an alliance of related archive institutions or measures of each national government, Europeana itself often organizes them to strengthen aggregations in each specific sector or theme in the form of redistributing funds provided by EU. In the beginning, Europeana expanded around traditional cultural resources (mainly those whose term of copyright protection expired), which were possessed by MLA (museums, libraries and archives). As Europeana consolidated its position as the central platform of European culture, aggregator organizations such as Europeana Fashion for fashion, European Film Gateway for film, and EU Screen for audio-visual genre were constructed, and cooperation among them advanced. Thus digital archives not only in traditional culture but also in the field of contemporary culture have strengthened their presence.

Since EU includes 28 diverse member states, it is easily imagined that aggregating

digital archives ranging over many special fields must be very difficult. The foundation of its realization is based on the multilayer structure of rules surrounding Europeana. Europeana has been established and operated mainly by EU’s initiative, so the role of rules decided on the EU level is important. Especially “Commission Recommendation on the digitization and online accessibility of cultural material and digital preservation” issued in 2011 urges the member nations to observe rules including the following: (1) Digitization programs in the future financed by public funds are subject to access to digitized materials through Europeana. (2) Aggregators of national and regional units are established and strengthened to send cultural resources of a variety of areas to Europeana, and aggregators crossing over specific fields and themes are supported. (3) The use of common digitization and metadata standard defined through cooperation between Europeana and archive institutions, and the systematic use of persistent identifiers are realized. (4) In order to realize the re-use through portals such as Europeana and innovative applications, wide and free availability of metadata prepared by cultural institutions are realized. Especially for free use of metadata, which is essential to collaboration and utilization of digital archives, “The Directive on the re-use of public sector information” (approved in 2003 and revised in 2013), the basis for EU’s open data policy, urges all public cultural institutions to open data to anyone non-discriminately free of charge or at inexpensive price in digitally readable format. Each member of EU supports politically

Conditions for National Digital Archive

IKEGAI Naoto

the expansion of Europeana by implementing these recommendations and directives domestically.

Europeana also sets many important rules and guidelines to embody the above contents. Their core is Data Exchange Agreement documents exchanged between Europeana and data providers (aggregators and individual archive institutions). The Data Exchange Agreement urges data providers to observe conditions including: (1) Data provided to Europeana conform to the common Europeana Data Model (EDM). (2) Rights of all the provided metadata are completely relinquished by a legal tool called CC0 (Creative Commons 0) to open those metadata in the public domain. (3) Every effort is made to provide accurate information on metadata regarding intellectual property rights of contents. (4) For preview of scaled-down images and partial sound and image, the re-use is allowed according to the conditions written in rights inscription domain of metadata. Data made open to the public by aggregators and individual archive institutions are managed in various ways reflecting uniqueness of each nation, region and field in terms of technology and handling of rights. Sharing the minimum standard necessary for cooperation makes it possible to build a platform covering entire Europe.

2. Why is it necessary?

For what purpose was such a structure of Europeana made? One of the core reasons is written in the book *Google and the Myth of*

Universal Knowledge: A View from Europe by Jean-Noël Jeanneney, then president of Bibliothèque nationale de France, who played a leading role in the establishment of Europeana. When the book was published in 2005, Google's large-scale project to digitize books was announced, which attracted attention widely in Japan. This project, which would digitize tens of millions of books based on enormous capital resources, was good news to archive institutions suffering from financial difficulty. At the same time, however, it evoked a sense of crisis in Europe because cultural resources, which were the basis of their identity, might be monopolized by one American corporation. If it became the norm for people around the world to access cultural resources of Europe through Google research engine, which occupies more than 90% market share in European countries, in other words, if Google occupies the position of a portal for European culture, values of European cultural resources could be ranked by Google's algorithm. It was also feared that Google's services based on the English language might undervalue the knowledge written in the languages of European countries. Such a sense of crisis hastened the construction of Europeana, as the cultural identity of Europe itself that can compete with Google in the digital era and as *supra* national digital archive, the home ground of cultural transmissions to the world.

By the way, EU's awareness of crisis about global platforms funded by the U.S. corporations including Google is not confined to the area of digital archives. Europe's legal measures, which are clearly responding

to the opposition to the U.S. capital, are too numerous to mention, e.g., competition authority's probe into arbitrary manipulation of search ranking, attempt of "Google tax" to combat news reporting services, and introduction of "the right to be forgotten" which enables individuals to object to search results for their own names. A keynote speech by Martin SCHULZ, European Parliament President at a large-scale conference in the field of data protection held in Brussels in January 2016 was entitled "Technological totalitarianism, politics and democracy," and the following part of the speech was symbolic of the situation: "Facebook, Google, Alibaba, Amazon: these companies must not be allowed to shape the new world order. They have no mandate to do so! It is and must remain the proper task of the democratically elected representatives of the people to agree on rules and enshrine them in laws. Anyone who disagrees with the decisions taken by the regulators can seek to have them overturned by political means, through the efforts of civil society. We call this process democracy." We now understand that ensuring democracy institutionally in the digital era, for fear that monopoly of data and access channels by private corporations might lead to formation of substantial world order, is found in the foundation of European information policy.

Even if this context is the premise, it is necessary to take notice that Europeana is not in a competitive and confrontational relationship with global platforms including Google. Considerable amount of digital archive aggregated at Europeana, especial-

ly in the field of books, was made in the Google's digitization project. Europeana is understood to be an attempt to include even digital cultural resources sporadically generated by foreign capital as a part of the collection of European cultural resources and position them properly. Recently Google started "Google Art Project" and constructs an advanced-feature digital archive portal, participated by the world's major archive organizations. Although it may be surprising, Europeana has its own special page on this portal and actively opens data aggregated from archive institutions throughout Europe. Europeana not only competes with global platforms funded by the U.S. capital, but also explores appropriate cooperation between global market power and European culture.

Of the aggregated data of Europeana, all the metadata are offered in the public domain, and as for previews, more than 30% of 50 million items can be freely re-used with the grant of Creative Commons licenses or Public Domain Marks. Such data are used for creative, educational and research activities of individuals and companies, and construction of a new digital service. They are also positively opened to social media services such as Facebook, Pinterest, Instagram and Tumblr. Especially Wikipedia Commons, repository of materials for Wikipedia, is positioned as Europeana's strategic target for providing data. One of its purposes is to increase the number of access by exposing the data on platforms, which receive more number of access than Europeana or individual cultural facilities, and thus maximize the social values of digital archives and

transmission of European cultural heritage. It is understandable that this is an attempt to seek a new role of digital archives shifting from 1.0 model, in which visitors watch static websites, to contemporary dynamic information environment represented by the word "web 2.0."

3. Situation in Japan

Now let us look at the situation of digital archives in Japan. Thanks to the long-term efforts of people involved, construction of digital archives in each field is proceeding steadily, and the finest examples are Cultural Heritage Online that shows data of more than 100,000 items of cultural heritage, and National Diet Library Digital Collections with more than 2.7 million digital books. Nevertheless, even in terms of the number of books only, the digitization project involving the national prestige is far behind one company called Google, which has digitized tens of millions of books. It is widely agreed that it is essential to strengthen and support the policy measures including capital aspect.

An equally important issue is the probability of finding archives. No matter how big the budget may be spent on a digital archive, it is meaningless if it were not found. As for an integrated portal on the national level similar to Europeana, National Diet Library Search has already collected more than 100 million metadata, but the majority is pure metadata such as information on library collections. This is significantly different from Europeana in which one can access to the

digital data of the work itself with a few clicks in principle. Also, as to its range of collection, it is hard to say that archives of the whole country and each field are covered. When it comes to promoting free use of metadata and previews, it has barely started. In short, portals to access to digital archives which Japan has constructed with a great deal of budget so far, that is, Japan's national digital archive, is practically private search engines for users at home and abroad. As the two large search companies Google and Yahoo are competing with each other in Japan, we would find some relief from the monopoly of access routes to culture and knowledge.

Under such circumstances, necessity of "integrated portals" for improved access to digital archives is clearly stated in "Intellectual Property Strategic Program 2015," which formulates an outline of Japan's policy on intellectual property. The program recognizes the present situation of digital archives and their problems as follows: "Each individual institution and field is grappling with problems, but sufficient cooperation between archives has not been achieved. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify an organizer of each field (aggregator) and improve the environment where digitized materials can be used on the centralized basis." With this awareness of the issues, it was pointed out that "efforts should be put into preparing the portal site which can conduct cross-sectional search." The following is stated as a measure to promote the use of archives: "Secondary use of digitized contents (using image data of artworks and others for publication, etc., republication of copyright-expired books, and use of video

contents in a classroom situation.” The description clearly points out the necessity of “Japanese version of Europeana” including the concept of aggregator. In order to proceed with the measures specifically, “liaison council and council of those involved in ministries and government offices in relation to digital archives” were set up in the Intellectual Property Strategy Headquarters, Cabinet Secretariat in September 2015. Now work is under way for cooperation and expansion of digital archives, open access to metadata, and promotion of the use of digital data.

4. My views on conditions for national digital archive

To construct a virtual national digital archive by collaborating with and aggregating an enormous amount of digital archives of cultural institutions based on Japan’s regional and specialized field with diverse individuality can be no easy task even if there is a clear national intention and support. Judging from such circumstances, there are not a few points that Japan can learn from the measures and structure of Europeana, which moves ahead with its task facing more complex cultural diversity than Japan. Specific measures such as clarification of aggregators, open access of metadata (licensing CC0) essential for collaboration, and promoting the use of data such as previews by applying Creative Commons, etc. are becoming international standard, which is emphasized in policies outside Europe, for example, DPLA.

However, the necessity itself of such policies is not obvious yet in Japan. In order to proceed smoothly with these policies, it is essential to obtain consensus on the idea to be realized by constructing national digital archive, in other words, the fundamental norms that should be the basis of various measures, widely among people involved in archive institutions and citizens. That is no more than thinking of conditions of the existence of national digital archive, which has no choice but to have the nature of a new kind of cultural institute, while it has the nature of a coalition of diverse cultural resources possessed by archive institutions including museums, libraries and archives as well as corporations and government offices. In order to make it clear, it would be necessary to accumulate long-term discourses and practices, but here I’d like to present three conditions in my essay to raise questions with reference to Europeana’s policies.

First, national digital archive should respect specialty, autonomy, variety and individuality accumulated by each specific region, field and archive institution. Europeana’s cooperative structure prioritizing activities by the unit of aggregators can be said to be the framework for such foundation. Europeana itself is only a lead to digital archives opened by aggregators and archive institutions of each country, region and field, in principle. Detailed metadata reflecting specialty and high quality digital data themselves are stored, managed and opened by each institution on its own. Europeana is formed on the foundation of digital archive promotion, human resource development,

and community formation in the aggregator unit, and through connecting them loosely at the metadata level. An aggregator structure should be positioned as a device, in the digital environment, which guarantees institutionally uniqueness and individuality of each region and field. It is feared that they could be neglected by the cooperation with IT services that would change the situation gradually.

At the same time, in order to enable comprehensive utilization as well as wide-area cooperation and aggregation, minimum common rules, that is, “laws” for standardization and opening of metadata, and setting of terms and conditions of usage are indispensable. Decision making, for example, for the operation of Europeana, data exchange agreement, and formation of EDM is realized in the multi-stakeholder process constituted of representatives from each aggregator, government officials, and user communities including research and educational institutions and firms. The enactment of the law to restrict members of a community called national digital archive, whether it is supra-national or national, should follow a democratic procedure by the constituent members themselves.

Secondly, national digital archive should expand the freedom of users to the maximum. Digitization and networking of culture are expanding the opportunities of active and creative activities and transmission for citizens, who have been one-way recipients of culture so far. Archive institutions, which are the foundation of public knowledge, need to play the role of supporting and enhancing such a possibility of democratization of

culture. The policy to promote the usage of digital archives through Europeana including open metadata and application of Creative Commons can be regarded as the core foundation for such democratization. National digital archive should guarantee free availability of digital archives by everyone as the foundation for free and creative activities and the infrastructure for freedom of expression.

Thirdly, national digital archive should promote creation of knowledge and inheritance of memories in society, as well as building identity of a community. The possibility of cross-sectional discovery and use of cultural resources enables us to carry out creative activities of new knowledge, which were not possible when resources were cut individually. At the same time, saving that knowledge in an archive institution as cultural resources enhances the circulation of knowledge creation and accumulation in society and contributes to the inheritance of memories that society has. Digital curation, in which narratives are recreated on the Internet by making full use of texts, images and films, related to certain incidents or history, is considered important in Europeana and it would be regarded symbolic effort. The inheritance of memories is the foundation of identity formation of each nation, region, specific field and a global community beyond such borders. National digital archive should function as a platform to promote both cultural “stock” called archive institutions and interaction of “flow” of use.

Due to the limit of space, I can introduce only Europeana as an example of related policies overseas. At present, construction of “national” digital archive is steadily progressing in Europe, the U.S., Asia, South America, Middle East and Africa reflecting their cultural background respectively. The progress of their archives contributes to form a digital archive that is common throughout the world on the Internet, whether they are national or based on identities of region or field. I expect that Japan’s digital archive will be able to play a meaningful role for the formation of the public foundation of global knowledge.

(Translated by NISHIZAWA Miki)

IKEGAI Naoto

Researcher of InfoCom Research and visiting associate professor of Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies at the University of Tokyo. His research interests are in the fields of information law and policy, digital cultural heritage, and digital platform strategy. Prior to his current position, Ikegai served as a faculty member of the University of Tokyo Library System and researcher of Art Archive Center at Tokyo University of the Arts. Ikegai holds a Ph.D. in Socio-information and Communication Studies from the University of Tokyo.

5. Lastly, beyond national