

Librarian@2010 – Educating for the Future
Lisbon 19th-21st of September 2007
By Andrew Cranfield, EBLIDA

EBLIDA in cooperation with BAD (The Portuguese Library Association) and EUCLID (European Association for Library and Information Education and Research) held its first joint conference in Lisbon in September this year. The overall theme of the conference was to investigate how academia and practice might be interlinked in a more constructive way for the benefit of both the research community and the library sector in general. With key note speeches from Lars Qvortrup from the Royal School of Library and Information Science in Copenhagen, Paul Sturges of IFLA/FAIFE and Keith Michael Fiels of the American Library Association the delegates were given insight in how the research and association community can benefit from each other. The two day conference also offered a number of presentations from around Europe looking at topics such as the integration of new web technologies in LIS education, research based learning in a private sector company and LIS curriculum guidelines.

For the organizations involved it offered the opportunity for a stimulating dialogue and the conclusion that if libraries are to be able to continue to live up to their role as important public institutions, much of this work must be research based and will demand that libraries, educational institutions, library associations and trade unions work closely together to place, in the words of IFLA President Claudia Lux, "libraries on the agenda".

Abstracts from the conference are available on the EBLIDA website and a number of papers from the conference will be submitted for publication in the journal *Education for Information*.

Orphan Works and Mass Digitisation
British Library

The following text is from a recently published briefing paper on orphan works and mass digitization by the British Library and can be freely distributed to interested parties. The paper highlights some of the problems connected with mass digitization activities of orphan works and provides an overview of a number of pragmatic solutions in relation to the challenge of providing access to these for users and citizens.

The Library estimates that over 40 percent of all in-copyright works are Orphan Works (1). Many public sector bodies hold large collections, encompassing the whole breadth of human creativity, with the consequence that

clearing rights for such large and varied collections is a particularly acute problem. This is compounded by the fact that such institutions have a remit to give access to their collections – with growing expectations that this should be via the web.

As the UK national library we work to balance the rights of creators to be recognised and rewarded for their work, with the public interest in ensuring access to information and ideas. As an academic and database publisher in our own right, we also understand the threats and opportunities presented to rights holders by the digital revolution.

The British Library made a significant contribution to the Gowers Review, and is a member of the High Level Copyright Group of the European Commission's *i2010 Digital Libraries* programme. The Library believes that any solution to Orphan Works, in an era of mass digitisation, needs to reflect the following seven principles:

■ **Clear Attribution.** In order to protect the moral rights of the creator, where known, clear attribution of the copyright owner must be made by parties involved in digitizing such works.

■ **Mixed Economy.** A "mixed-economy" approach to any Orphan Works solution that provides a role for collecting societies, as well as a legislative solution that allows for the organisation undertaking the digitisation to assume responsibility for the use of the work would be desirable (2).

■ **Search Guidelines.** Certain categories of creative works are well regulated and well-represented; while others (e.g. unpublished works, grey literature and oral histories etc) have very high levels of Orphan Works (3). Clear search guidelines that address the differing circumstances around different types of Orphan Works are needed.

■ **Scalable Guidelines for a Reasonable Search.** Small projects may allow for a diligent search, but a title by title search for rights holders would make any mass digitization project impossible due to the high costs associated with the permissions process.

Certain types of works have such high levels of "orphans" that any detailed search would not constitute a responsible use of public funds. In order to encourage the use of Orphan Works, parameters for a reasonable search need to reflect the public benefits gained from mass digitisation, while at the same time protecting the rights of the copyright holder. Any Orphan Works solution needs to be scalable, and in the case of mass digitization programmes util-

ise “unified processes”, including but not limited to a search of available rights holders’ databases; advertising for rights holders in industry publications; the availability of an appropriate collective licensing solution etc.

■ **Safe Harbour Status for Public Bodies.** The unique position of libraries, museums and galleries as public organisations with large collections and a remit to facilitate public access – which increasingly happens across the web – needs to be addressed. In order for public benefit to be derived from the large cost of mass digitisation, the British Library recommends that any provision for Orphan Works contains a safe harbour for public sector bodies, if a reasonable search can be demonstrated, and any disputed works can be subsequently removed from public circulation.

■ **Consensus on Historical cut-off Points.** All commercial creative works have a product lifecycle. Work-specific agreement between rights holders and cultural institutions around historical cut-off points, where it can be agreed a category of work no longer has significant economic value but has high academic and social value, would do much to facilitate mass digitisation and alleviate the Orphan Works issues currently being addressed at a European and domestic level.

■ **Preventative Action.** We have seen an explosion in online publishing and therefore the potential for the creation of Orphan Works is growing. Any guidelines need to incorporate measures or recommendations for best-practice, in order to prevent the creation of future Orphan Works.

(1) Orphan Works – An in-copyright work where it is not possible to track down the rights holder because they are not known or cannot be traced.

(2) The US legislative proposal for Orphan Works allows for users to take responsibility for use of an Orphan Work: <http://www.copyright.gov/orphan/orphan-report.pdf>

(3) No Idea is an Island – Rights Clearance of Sound Recordings by the British Library. B White. Copyright World. Issue 167. February 2007.

Parliament vote in favour of the European Qualifications Framework

By Carmen Morlon, EU Information Officer

The European Parliament voted on 24 of October in favour of adopting the Recommendation on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF), proposed by the Commission in September last year. The EQF will make qualifications more transparent. It aims mainly at promoting mobility between countries, and at facilitating lifelong learning. At the core of the EQF are its eight reference levels, from basic to advanced, which describe what a learner knows, understands and is able to do, regardless of the system in which the learner's qualification was acquired. As an instrument for promoting lifelong learning, the EQF encompasses general and adult education, vocational education and training, as well as higher education.

The EQF describes levels of qualifications in terms of

learning outcomes. The awarding of qualifications will remain a matter for national qualifications bodies. The primary users of the EQF will be bodies in charge of national and/or Sectoral qualification systems and frameworks. For individuals, the EQ Framework will make it easier to describe their broad level of competence as well as simpler to read across from one qualification system to another.

The Recommendation, to be formally adopted by the Council in the coming weeks, foresees that Member States relate their national qualifications systems (NQF) to the EQF by 2010, and that individual certificates or diplomas should bear an EQF reference by 2012. There are no formal legal obligations on the countries to take on the EQF, but most countries are already developing a NQF and France, Ireland, Malta and the UK already have one.

As a voluntary instrument, the EQF is without prejudice to *Directive 2005/36/EC on the mutual recognition of professional qualifications*.

As regards Europass, all relevant Europass documents, in particular the Europass diploma supplement and the Europass certificate supplement should contain a clear reference to the appropriate EQF level in the future.

Vis-à-vis the EQF is fully compatible with the qualifications framework for Higher Education developed under the Bologna Process; the EQF descriptors at levels 5-8 refer to the higher education descriptors agreed under the Bologna Process; the formulation of such descriptors however differs from the Bologna level descriptors because the EQF also encompasses vocational education and training (VET) and work contexts at the highest levels.

For further information visit http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/eqf/index_en.html.

Knowledge-sharing emerges as the most pressing priority for the European Research Area

The European Commission received more than 800 contributions to the public consultation on the future of the European Research Area (ERA). The consultation, which continued at a high-level conference in Lisbon on 8-10 October (http://ec.europa.eu/research/conferences/2007/fst/index_en.htm), identified a number of key issues for the future of the ERA. The six priority areas suggested by the Commission were confirmed, with knowledge-sharing emerging as the most pressing if the ERA vision is to be achieved.

Over 80% of respondents welcome the concept of open access to both publications and raw data. However access to scientific data and access to scientific publications raise different issues and concerns among stakeholders. Most replies called for raw data resulting from publicly-funded research to be made more readily accessible, and argued that peer-reviewed scientific publications should be accessible free of charge (see the preliminary results at http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/preliminaryresults-eraconsultation_en.pdf).