



Europeana Network Association's Response to Europeana Evaluation Roadmap

18 January 2017

The following are the European Network Association's responses to each section of the [Europeana Evaluation Roadmap](#).

Preamble

- The European Network Association (ENA) welcomes the publication of a Roadmap for an Independent evaluation of Europeana (following adoption of Council Conclusions by EYCS Council on 31/05/2016) and the invitation to provide feedback to this document.
- In our response we would like to refer to our Input for evaluation from September 2016 which we annex hereto for your convenience. We regret to see that the proposed two step approach outlined in our September 2016 Input for Evaluation has not been taken up, but understand that the mechanisms at the disposal of the Commission dictates this to a degree. .
- Many of Europeana's past and present issues have already been identified and addressed in Europeana's current strategy and business plan. It seems to us that the proposed evaluation ignores the dynamic nature of the organisation. This seems to be hampered by the mechanisms under which the Commission has to run the evaluation making it impossible to put an emphasis of the evaluation on forward looking aspects rather than addressing past and current issues only.
- The role of the European Network Association is defined as day-to-day activities and advice on strategy. Its role in decision making with the Europeana Foundation is overlooked in the current draft. Therefore a suggestion for a better-defined mission for ENA has been added below.
- Important concepts such as Europeana's role in increasing standardisation, transparency and in cost reduction are missing in the current draft Europeana Evaluation Roadmap.
- It seems that the contractor will have a lot of influence on the outcome of the evaluation. This is because the document lists the evaluation questions, but doesn't provide detail regarding the metrics used. The contractor is tasked to work on a methodology. It would be useful to find a way to comment on the pre-final methodology.



- What concerns the financial "benchmarking against similar national and international endeavours", ENA considers that this will be a very challenging endeavour, given the unique scope of Europeana. We therefore suggest to involve Europeana and the taskforce members on Benchmarking, in assessing what is considered to be similar in order to be benchmarked against. For Benchmarking in general we would like to refer to a [report published in September 2016](#).
- Past achievements can only be a partial basis for recommendations towards the future. Future developments of Europeana strongly depend on outside developments (e.g. innovation with media and information technology, but also national policy developments). There is no linear path from lessons learned from the evaluation to a solid future strategy for Europeana; assessment of upcoming innovation outside Europeana is crucial as well. Europeana's willingness and capacity to continuously develop its strategy to be better targeted towards constant changing user needs are, in this digital age, not a sign of weakness but a strength. An evaluation of how the user needs have changed over the last 10 years is a necessary baseline. Those who will make the recommendations, or even better: those that receive these recommendations should be explicitly aware of this.

A. Purpose

"To assess Europeana in terms of its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and EU added value. The results will be used to inform orientations for Europeana's future development."

ENA agrees with and understands the purpose of the Evaluation, but would formally wish to emphasize the need to look forward rather than back. Europeana achieved against a different set of challenges in "an older context" and technologies.

B. Content & subject of the evaluation

B.1 Subject area

"Launched in November 2008 as "The European Digital Library," aiming to make Europe's cultural heritage accessible to all, through a single access point. Its creation was initiated by a letter from six heads of state and government in 2005. Since then the following policy, coordination and funding initiatives by the Commission have framed the development of Europeana:

- *Commission's strategy for digitisation, online accessibility and digital preservation to make Europe's cultural, audio-visual and scientific heritage accessible, easy and interesting to use online;*



- *Commission's recommendations of August 2006 and October 2011+ call for concerted action by MS to digitise and preserve their cultural heritage, to make it available online, to encourage their cultural institutions to make their digitised material available through Europeana;*
- *MSEG on digitisation and digital preservation assists the Commission in monitoring progress with implementation of recommendation including national actions contributing to the further development of Europeana;*
- *Consecutive funding programmes since 2007 to date has supported both the central coordination and the European integration of national efforts to make digital cultural material accessible through Europeana including standardisation, interoperability and targeted digitisation.*

In the current MFF, Europeana is recognised as a well established DSI with priority for funding under the CEF.

Today Europeana is Europe's digital platform for cultural heritage. It currently provides access to over 53 million items incl. Image, text, sound, video and 3D material from the collections of over 3700 libraries, archives, museums, galleries and audio-visual collection across Europe.

Europeana ingests metadata while the objects which are made accessible continue to be held by the contributing institutions.

Europeana Network of cultural heritage, creative and technology professionals exchange and promote best practice on digitisation and metadata standardisation and simulate capacity building in the cultural heritage community."

Suggested changes

Add the recommendations of November 2008

- Commission's recommendations of August 2006, [November 2008](#) and October 2011+ call for concerted action by MS

(last paragraph Europeana Network of cultural heritage....).

Suggested new wording: The Europeana Network of cultural heritage, creative and technology professionals is an essential part of the Europeana ecosystem. Together with the Europeana Foundation, it builds capacity to drive cross-border and cross-sector co-operation, helps facilitate innovation in the cultural heritage community. It sets up task forces with professionals from the network to help develop and implement relevant frameworks, standards and best practice. Via its Members Council (a body of elected representatives), the Europeana Network Association participates in Europeana governance and strategy. The Europeana Network Association Management Board represents the Network on the Foundation Governing Board.

B.3 How the objectives were to be achieved

"Europeana offers the following services to its three target audiences:



- *Data Partner services include the infrastructure that enables cultural heritage institutions to deliver and ingest their data to the platform, as well as the European Professional site with information for cultural institutions and cultural professionals.*
- *End user services include the main portal Europeana Collections with enhanced features such as Thematic Collections and Exhibitions as well as reaching end users through external platforms such as Wikipedia, Facebook, Pinterest.*
- *Re-user services where the material is made available for professional reuse, through APIs and dedicated sites: Europeana Labs for creative community, and Europeana Research for the research community, Europeana has been exploring re-use of collections in education, research, tourism and creative industries, through collaboration with partners such as Wikipedia, Apple and Google.*

Europeana's annual business plans set major priorities for each year.

Europeana is steered by the Europeana Foundation established under Dutch law. Its governing board meets four times per year to set strategy and policy.

Europeana is supported by the Europeana Network Association which gathers cultural heritage, creative and technology professionals who support the day-to-day activities of Europeana and advises on its strategy."

Suggested changes:

(last paragraph) Europeana is supported by the constantly growing Europeana Network Association, currently 1700 volunteers who represent the diversity in the cultural heritage domain, participate in Europeana governance, strategy and policies, promote cross border cooperation and dialogue in the digital cultural heritage community; co-develop and validate frameworks and standards to improve interoperability; promote the vision and values of Europeana, and encourage the use of Europeana by other sectors.

C. Scope of the evaluation

C.1 Topics covered

"Considering Europeana has been in operation for eight years, the scope of evaluation will cover both the underlying concept and value of Europeana as a European cultural and digital innovation project as well as in depth review of the adequacy and viability of the services provided by Europeana as a DSI under CEF. The evaluation will be based on the five mandatory criteria of the Better Regulation Guidelines (effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, EU added value).

In particular the evaluation will examine the following aspects of Europeana in detail:

- *Europeana's capacity as a catalyst for innovation for cultural heritage in a digital environment*
- *Core platform services for the data partners, end users, reusers*



- *Data and functionality offered*
- *Technical infrastructure*
- *Europeana professional network and ecosystem*
- *Legal form, governance structure and management*
- *Platform sustainability*

The evaluation, as well as assessment of possible options for the future development of Europeana, will be conducted with the assistance of a panel of 3-4 outside experts from different fields of relevant expertise including a panel rapporteur who will draft the report.

The expert panel will be supported by a contractor who will help refine the evaluation questions and methodology and will gather and analyse convincing data to underpin the evaluation and the scoping of orientations for possible future value positions and services.”

Suggested changes:

- On “Underlying concept and value of Europeana”: it should be noted that the assessment of the concept and value 8 years ago was different from today. The main perspective of the evaluation should be made clear: is it set against the original mindset from 2008 (which was driven by metadata and aggregation of a high volume of data) or against the current user driven value assessment? The latter is more useful for the future but may bias the outcomes of the evaluation. How have users needs evolved over the last ten years should be taken as the baseline for any evaluation.
-
- On Europeana’s capacity as a catalyst. The enormous changes we have seen in technology over the last 10 years can be seen as an external evolution. Evaluating the role of Europeana in influencing change for itself and related projects and understanding the dynamics of the ecosystem would be beneficial
- The topic ‘sustainability’ is not only relevant for the platform, but also for the Europeana ecosystem. The very existence of Europeana has contributed to more cohesion, understanding and trust within and among the community of digital heritage specialists in Europe. Through Europeana, long standing collaborations across countries and institutions could be established. So we suggest to add a bullet beneath Platform sustainability: “Europeana professional network and ecosystem sustainability looking at community aspects”

How to evaluate:

- The draft of the Roadmap only mentions *what* should be examined, not *how* that should be done. The ENA recommends to use the three impact areas of the [Europeana Impact Framework](#) for this (as already suggested in Input from Europeana Network Association for Evaluation (September 2016), annexed hereto. These three areas are:



- *Social Cultural impact* ('Deeper understanding'): this relates to the user groups (the five markets of Europeana) and their appreciation for the cultural content and the functionality provided by Europeana. Relevant for: *“Core platform services for the data partners, end users, reusers”* , *“Data and functionality offered”* and *“Platform sustainability”*
- *Innovation impact* ('Innovative and Influential Network'): this relates to the achievements of Europeana by showing leadership in the cultural heritage domain to address the challenges that emerged with the digital shift in society. The evaluation should make clear to what degree the cultural heritage domain has benefited from the work of Europeana collectively (at the European level and at the national level) and individually (at the institutional level). For instance, the aggregation system in its current effective and fruitful way wouldn't exist, if not for Europeana. For instance, the German Digital Library (DDB) and the Dutch national aggregator were founded with direct and explicit links to Europeana. Relevant for: *“Europeana's capacity as a catalyst for innovation for cultural heritage in a digital environment”*, *“Europeana professional network and ecosystem”* and *“Legal form, governance structure and management”*
- *Economic impact* ('Improved Welfare'): this has two dimensions that need to be taken on board in the evaluation. On the one hand it would be good to assess the level of cost reduction that Europeana has established by being a centrifugal force in the entire cultural heritage domain in Europe. Europeana has done this, for instance, by establishing common international standards, frameworks (e.g. EDM) and guidelines, by managing shared services, by creating a level playing field for ICT and content providers across Europe and by providing a focus for national governments to develop national policies for digital heritage. On the other hand, it would be good to look into the activities that Europeana has undertaken to stimulate entrepreneurship (through challenges, hackathons etc) with digital cultural heritage across Europe. Relevant for: *“Europeana's capacity as a catalyst for innovation for cultural heritage in a digital environment”*, *“Core platform services for the data partners, end users, reusers”* , *“Technical infrastructure”* and *“Platform sustainability”*

C.2 Questions/Issues to be examined

“The evaluation will assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and EU added value of Europeana in relation to its current situation. Evaluation questions will include:

Relevance

- *To what extent is the concept of Europeana relevant to the needs of the EU? Are Europeana's outputs and results relevant to EU priorities in particular the flowering of cultures of the MS and the digital single market?*



- *Are Europeana's services relevant to the needs of its user groups; data partners, end users, reusers?*
- *How relevant is the content of metadata?*
- *How relevant is Europeana as a facilitator of professional exchange of cultural and technological expertise in the digital heritage community?*

-

Effectiveness

- *How successful have the offered services been in meeting requirements of the different audiences? How effective is Europeana in reaching end users and reusers?*
- *What has been the progress towards achieving an impact based, where applicable, on statistics and performance indicators? Are the current performance indicators of Europeana sufficient for monitoring progress?*
- *Has the underlying technical infrastructure and functionality of Europeana been adequate for achieving its objectives?*
- *Does Europeana's governance ensure the most inclusive and effective operation?*
- *To what extent have the presentation of results and outputs of Europeana to stakeholders and the public been effective?*
- *How does Europeana meet the requirements of a fast changing technological environment?*

Efficiency

- *How efficient is the current aggregation infrastructure?*
- *How efficient is the current governance structure?*
- *To what extent is the current support scheme efficient to respond the needs of Europeana and its stakeholders?*
- *How do the costs involved compared to the achieved results and impact?*

Coherence

- *How coherent are Europeana's activities and services internally?*
- *To what extent is Europeana coherent with other national or international initiatives with similar objectives (eg. national aggregators such as Gallica, Hispana, German Digital Library;, research infrastructures such as DARIAH, E-RIHS or DPLA)*
- *To what extent is europeana coherent with wider EU policy, including with the European Agenda for Culture in 2007 whereby cultural heritage has been a priority under successive Council Work Plans for Culture?*

EU added value

- *What is the EU added value of Europeana compared to what could be achieved by the private sector or by MS at national and / or regional level?*
- *Have there been national, European or international developments that would not have happened without Europeana"*



Suggested changes:

Relevance ([Forward-looking](#))

- Europeana is shifting strategically from a focus on data quantity (aggregating more content from more content providers) to a focus on quality (better data for end user services). Is this seen to be beneficial to the cultural heritage institutions and the EU Member States? Value should be placed on the big data aspect, Europeana as the cross-domain single access point, its use in research and discovery.

Effectiveness ([backward-looking](#))

- *What has been the progress towards achieving an impact, based, where applicable, on statistics and performance indicators? Are the current performance indicators of Europeana sufficient for monitoring progress?*
- *To what extent have the presentation of results and outputs of Europeana to stakeholders and the public been effective?*

Suggested changes and additional clauses :

- What has been the progress towards achieving an impact, based, where applicable, on statistics and performance indicators? Are the current performance indicators of Europeana sufficient for monitoring progress? **Or would the [Impact Framework](#) be a better mechanism?**
- To what extent have the presentation of results and outputs of Europeana to stakeholders and the public been effective, **given the available funds?**
- What effect has Europeana had on European Aggregation?
- Have services emerged and become aligned under the umbrella of Europeana?

From a historic perspective the question: “How successful have the offered services been in meeting requirements of the different audiences? How effective is Europeana in reaching end users and reusers?” should be preceded by the question “How successful has Europeana been in addressing the original policy priorities set by the EU and the member states for Europeana in 2008?”

Efficiency ([backward-looking](#))



- *To what extent is the current support scheme efficient to respond the needs of Europeana and its stakeholders?*

It is unclear to us what “current support scheme” is - a clarification would be useful.

- An analysis of the impact of the changed financing scheme between the CIP ICT PSP and the CEF DSI would be useful. For instance: considering the differences in a very practical way: how much did each process cost in time and money, what were problems and benefits of each when you compare the various aspects. Such a study should give important clues for a proposal of a new form of financing in view of better sustainability.

- *How do the costs involved compare to the achieved results and impact?*

The scope of this question should be defined. Costs for Europeana Foundation, for the Europeana Network, for every Europeana related project that has been awarded by the EC?

Suggested addition:

- Given the premise that collaboration can lead to saving costs by sharing resources and infrastructure, how much has been saved by collaborating with Europeana?
-

Coherence (policy)

- *To what extent is Europeana coherent with other national or international initiatives with similar objectives (eg. national aggregators such as Gallica, Hispana, German Digital Library,; research infrastructures such as DARIAH, E-RIHS or DPLA)*

DPLA, Trove, Digital NZ have similar objectives at international levels, Hispana and DDB at national levels and Gallica within the library domain in France. It is important to determine how the coherence works. For research infrastructures the question should be coherence in terms of complementarity.

Suggested addition:

- What has Europeana meant for the developed national strategies and to what extent is Europeana coherent with those strategies?

EU added value

Suggested addition:



If Europeana did not exist what would be the areas of market failure for the EU/EC?

C.3 Other tasks

“The results of evaluation will form the basis for the assessment of options and the formulation of orientations for the possible future value proposition and scope of Europeana, and may include recommendations on target user groups and provided services, underlying technical solutions, governance, corresponding costs, and future viability. It will also investigate possibilities to transform or integrate Europeana into a European legal entity.”

Suggested changes:

Future value proposition and scope of Europeana cannot only be based on the results of the evaluation. They also very much depend on outside development, with digital user behaviour, technical development and governmental policies as the most defining factors. As for the former, we recommend that the evaluation results are explicitly matched with recent trend reports in digital services before they can be transformed into recommendations for future developments of Europeana. As for the latter, it should also be acknowledged that the future strategy of Europeana (and digital heritage in general for that matter) should be based on a **balance** between a user centered approach and the positioning of public cultural collections in the information society. Cultural heritage institutions, and Europeana as their European flagship, have a specific role in society to secure the relevance of historical information in modern (and future) society. As a consequence, the future role of Europeana also strongly relates to constants and changes in governmental policies to support this specific aspect of the information society.

ANNEX

Input from Europeana Network Association for Evaluation (September 2016)



Europeana Network Association

Input for the independent evaluation of Europeana

15 September 2016

The Europeana Network Association welcomes the recommendation from the Council Conclusions on *The role of Europeana for the digital access, visibility and use of European cultural heritage* (June 2016) to present to the Council, by October 2017, an independent evaluation of Europeana and give clear orientations for the mid- and long-term development of Europeana. The Europeana Network Association recommends a two-step approach in this evaluation. The first step is a summative evaluation of Europeana in the three areas identified in the Europeana Impact Framework, which results in an overall assessment of Europeana as it currently operates and in an overview of the main lessons learned. The second step is a review of the refined strategy that Europeana will have developed as a follow-up to the Council Conclusions. This step results in recommendations for the vision of Europeana beyond 2020 and for the implementation of a new Europeana Strategy. The Europeana Networks Association suggests to apply this two-step approach, as it strongly believes that each step requires different expertise within the group of evaluators.

Step 1: Summative evaluation of Europeana

The key question in the first part of the evaluation is: **Is the impact that Europeana has had according to expectations and in line with the investments made?** As a methodology to provide an answer to this question, the Europeana Network Association suggests to use the [Europeana Impact Framework](#), developed with the Europeana Network. This framework identifies three impact areas:

- Social-Cultural impact ('Deeper understanding')
- Innovation impact ('Innovative and Influential Network')
- Economic impact ('Improved Welfare')

Social-Cultural impact

The *Social-Cultural impact* relates to Europeana's end user groups and their appreciation for the cultural content and the functionality provided by Europeana. We do not expect the evaluation to include the results of a new extensive survey on overall user satisfaction. There have already been several user and impact studies on Europeana that can be taken on board in the



evaluation (e.g. the impact study of Europeana 1914-1918). There are also many other reports addressing the use and types of users of digital cultural heritage in general. The Europeana Network Association would like to particularly point out that *The New Renaissance* report (published in 2011) might provide a good point of reference for expectations regarding access and use of digital cultural heritage in general and Europeana in particular.

In general terms, the Europeana Network Association would expect that the independent evaluation will provide an overall assessment of the relationship between Europeana and its user base, in all its varieties, through all its channels (portal, social media, local events etc.). It would make sense if in this respect a distinction is made between general use (focused on access through a single point of entry to cultural content according to interest) and re-use (focussed on high quality material with rights cleared). Since Europeana considers Education, Research and Creative Industries among the primary re-users, these groups should get special attention in the evaluation.

Innovation impact

The Innovation impact relates to the achievements of Europeana by showing leadership in the cultural heritage domain to address the challenges that emerged with the digital shift in society. The evaluation should make clear to what degree the cultural heritage domain has benefited from the work of Europeana collectively (at the European level and at the national level) and individually (at the institutional level).

The Association recommends that the evaluators look in more detail at how Europeana has served as a catalyst in the following area's:

- Technology (e.g. platform, search and retrieval, cloud services)
- Services (e.g. multilingual access and distribution of digital cultural heritage)
- Data standardisation (e.g. EDM, data quality)
- Sustainability of project results from Europeana-related projects (E.g. Europeana Fashion, Europeana Sounds, Europeana inside, Europeana Space, Europeana Local, APEX, EU-SCREEN, ENUMERATE, etc.)
- Advocacy (e.g. policy development, copyright reform)
- Networking (shared expertise building, outreach and inclusiveness, governance; this point should also look at relationships that Europeana has built with initiatives in other parts of the world).

Economic impact

Finally, the *Economic impact* has, in the view of the Europeana Network Association, two dimensions that need to be taken on board in the evaluation. On the one hand it would be good to assess the level of cost reduction that Europeana has established by being a centrifugal force



in the entire cultural heritage domain in Europe. Europeana has done this, for instance, by establishing common international standards, frameworks (e.g. EDM) and guidelines, by managing shared services, by creating a level playing field for ICT and content providers across Europe and by providing a focus for national governments to develop national policies for digital heritage. On the other hand, it would be good to look into the activities that Europeana has undertaken to stimulate entrepreneurship (through challenges, hackathons etc) with digital cultural heritage across Europe.

Governance

Besides these three impact areas there is one internal issue of Europeana that is addressed in the recommendation in the Council Conclusions, and that should be incorporated in this evaluation: the governance of Europeana. We invite the evaluation committee to have a look at the way that Europeana has taken measures to guarantee that all the voices of its major stakeholders are heard. These measures could relate to the making of strategic choices as well as to including experts from all heritage domains and from across Europe. The Evaluation Committee should assess the Europeana Governance structure, whether it represents all its major stakeholders in a balanced way. On a more generic level, it would be interesting to know whether the current organisational model of Europeana is fit to manage the Cultural Digital Service Infrastructure for the European single market.

The Europeana Network Association expects that this first step of the independent evaluation results in a report that includes overall assessments on the three impact areas in relation to the topics raised above, from which can be deduced whether Europeana has had a transformative role and as such provided value for money. In addition, we expect the report to include a set of lessons learned, that can be taken on board in the second step of the independent evaluation, in which the new vision on the future development of Europeana will be assessed.

Step 2: Review of the revised Europeana Strategy

The key question in the second part of the evaluation is: **Does the refined vision and strategy of Europeana set the right priorities for enlarging its impact?** The publication of the Council Conclusions on the role of Europeana has led to a partial revision of Europeana's current strategy. The plan to have an independent evaluation provides a good opportunity to assess this new direction that Europeana has set for itself to own its position in the long-term. In this evaluation, it is important to not only look at Europeana, but also at the environment in which Europeana operates, such as cultural policy development, technological innovation and changes in digital user behaviour. The evaluation should help assess whether Europeana shows sufficient awareness of these and other outside factors that have an impact on its own



success. As this review requires different expertise among the evaluators, the Europeana Network Association suggests to have a separate procedure for this review and not include it in the evaluation as performed in Step 1. The lessons learned from the evaluation as performed in Step 1 however, will provide a good context to assess whether Europeana's new strategy will mitigate sufficiently the challenges that currently exist.

The recommendation on evaluation of Europeana in the Council Conclusions provide some two main topics that can be addressed in the review of the new Europeana Strategy: the future scope and sustainable public funding, whilst taking account of the dual nature of Europeana as both a cultural and digital innovation project. The Europeana Network Association would like to present here some questions on each of these issues that may give shape to the setup of the review.

The future scope

In its proposed change to the current strategy, Europeana addresses five issues that together determine the future scope of Europeana: Platform, Content, Users, Creative Industries and European value. We would encourage the reviewers of the new strategy to address these issues explicitly, for instance by providing answers to the following questions:

- In line with user needs Europeana is shifting strategically from a focus on quantity (aggregating more content from more content providers) to a focus on quality (better data for end user services). Is this seen to be sufficiently beneficial to the cultural heritage institutions and the EU Member States?
- Besides running the European single entry point for search and retrieval, Europeana will have invested more in Thematic Collections and an online exhibition platform, to be able to better reach and server users. Can the reviewers assess the scalability and sustainability of Thematic Collection Partnerships to increase the reach of and benefits for end user communities?
- Does Europeana have the ability to strengthen their B2B relationships with Education, Research and Creative Industries?
- Is it realistic of Europeana to expect that Cultural Heritage Institutions are willing and able to (continuously) improve their (meta)data to improve the search functionality?
- Is there value in offering shared semantic services for professional partners such as national aggregators and individual institutions?
- Are the choices that Europeana intends to make for further technological development of the platform, future-proof?
- Which innovation and research opportunities are provided by the platform and the accumulated big cultural data? What is the added value of aggregations in relation to big



data pools that are, under their own sovereignty, created by cultural heritage institutions and other institutions across the EU Member States?

Sustainable funding

- Does the Evaluation Committee consider the public funds made available to Europeana as adequate for managing and improve a Cultural Digital Service Infrastructure for the European single market?
- Are there opportunities missed to acquire more private funding for Europeana?
- Will the strategic choices that Europeana has made for improving their shared services contribute to further cost reduction across the entire cultural heritage domain in Europe?
- Are there in other domains alternative funding mechanisms that are supported by the EU and/or EU Member States that might be applicable to Europeana in order to increase Europeana's sustainability (e.g. the ERIC's in the sciences?)

Value of Europeana as both a cultural and innovation project

Finally, we invite the Evaluation Committee to provide an overall assessment of the value of digital culture to build stronger connections within Europe (markets, people, cultures). This would require the Evaluation Committee to also look into future cultural policy developments in both the EU and its Member States. What are the tangible and intangible benefits of a culturally connected Europe via digital means? The ultimate question for this review would then be: do these benefits validate the planned investments in Europeana?

=====

Suggested selection criteria for evaluators

Evaluators should have expertise in:

Publishing technologies, Distributed systems, Partnership building, Customer relationship building, Network building and maintenance, standards setting, market and impact assessment and platform performance,

They should have access to skills in audience analysis, ux design, multilingual search retrieval, data modeling.



The Europeana Network Association so far suggests the following people as potential evaluators:

- Simon Tanner – professor dealing with Impact in the digital world - impact
- Joost Poort – Potential Market evaluator - eg. size and potential of markets: education etc
- Sue Gardner – ex Wikipedia Executive Director - platform
- Reviewers - Gianna, Jared -
- Mia Ridge – Social media, digital library and museum expert - users / reusers
- Mark Hahnel, founder of Figshare, UK-based platform for scientific publishing - platform
- Dries Buytaert, founder of Drupal (popular open-source CMS) and Acquia, a platform for content marketing, Brussels-based - platform
- Kaitlin Thaney of Mozilla - search
- Makx Dekkers, an independent consultant with an extensive experience in information technology, standardisation and international co-operation. - knowledge of decisions in the context the time they were made... no longer directly involved
- Pedro Szekely (<http://usc-isi-i2.github.io/szekely/>) from University of Southern California (the American Art Collaborative) - semantic web
- Dan Brickley, Google - semantic web
- Carole Goble (researcher on knowledge and information management, distributed information systems and interoperability of applications and new ways of doing *in silico* science, scientific publication and curation. <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/research/Carole.goble/personaldetails>)
- Simon Rein (srein@google.com), he is the programm manager of the Google cultural Insitute and a former colleague of Ellen Euler, with understanding of role of Europeana
- Felix Sasaki, fellow of the W3C team. He knows the Europeana environment, but is not directly associated and is semantic web, data and standardisation expert

Authors: Ellen Euler, Max Kaiser, Rolf Källman, Marco de Niet Members Council on behalf of the Europeana Network Association.