

## MILE KICK OFF MEETING MINUTES

9.30am – 4.30pm, 11<sup>th</sup> January 2007

Thistle Hotel Hyde Park, London, UK

### Present:

Aisa-bcn	AIS	Xavier Castell	XC	Director
Alinari	ALI	Sam Minelli	SM	R & D Engineer
BAPLA	BAP	Sarah Saunders	SS	Chair of Metadata Committee
Bildombudsmannen AB	STA	Staffan Teste	ST	Lawyer
Bridgeman Art Library	BAL	Harriet Bridgeman	HB	Managing Director
		Jessica Tier	JT	MILE Project Manager
		Lucy Geering	LG	MILE Project Assistant
		Annette Godefroid	AG	Berlin General Manager
		Steffen Wedepohl	SW	Berlin Liaison
		Adrian Gibbs	AG	Collections Manager
		Paul King	PK	IT Manager / R&D
Citypassenger	CTP	Abdelghani Chibani	AC	
Fotofinder	FOT	Ali Paczensky	AP	Managing Director
SPK	SPK	Monika Hagedorn-Saupe	MHS	Deputy Director
		Axel Ermert	AE	Scientist
System Simulation	SSL	Mike Coyne	MC	General Manager
		Graham Howard	GH	Design Director
Trinity College Dublin	TCD	Frank Boland	FB	Professor
Wardynski & Partners	WAR	Janusz Kolcznski	JK	Lawyer

### Absent:

Archetypon	ARC	George Kordelis	GK	Project Manager
		Vassillos Nikolopoulos	VN	
Citypassenger	CTP	Bruno Duval	BD	

<b>WELCOME</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p>1. HB welcomes all partners, thanks them for their involvement in MILE, apologises for change of meeting date. Gives introduction to BAL's work.</p> <p>JT welcomes all partners to MILE and states KO meeting's aim as introducing and establishing the project; MILE was granted EU funding thanks to strength of its partnerships. MILE's main intentions are bringing together the expertise of all partners from all over Europe to increase the use and trade of and the accessibility of digital images throughout Europe. See PowerPoint presentation attached.</p> <p>Partners introduce themselves and their companies, and state their intentions regarding MILE.</p>	

		Action
<b>2.</b>	<b>WORK PACKAGE 1 (WP1) NETWORK AGREEMENT – JT, MILE</b>	
<b>2.1</b>	<p><b>Network Agreement</b></p> <p>JT asks for any questions or points raised by the Network Agreement (NA), which JT sent to partners prior to meeting, and is also included in each partners' meeting package. States NA as 1<sup>st</sup> project deliverable.</p> <p>JK asks for the Annexes stated in NA; JT to chase up from EU.</p> <p>SM asks when NA needs to be signed by? JT says end of Jan 07.</p> <p>JT outlines Executive Committee's members and role within MILE.</p> <p>HB notes overall deadline for WP1 as March 07, and notes that SSL have already starting working on the website.</p> <p>XC proposes that AIS is included in WP2 (see WP2 below).</p>	<p><b>JT</b></p> <p><b>BAL</b></p>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>WEBSITE DISCUSSION AND WORK PACKAGE 2 (WP2) METADATA CLASSIFICATION DISCUSSION – MC, GH; SSL</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<p>MC describes website's development in 3 phases; Core Site, Discussion Forum and Orphan Images.</p> <p><b>Phase 1: Core Site</b> to contain general project information, project news and meetings, access to discussion forums, access to key documentation and tutorials. The tutorials would consist of condensed, packaged presentations of results from discussions, as part of a quick guide as to how to follow and adopt practice proposals.</p> <p>i) AP asks if the forum area will be accessible to the public? GH says the forum will have 2 parts; 1 which will be an ongoing internal forum, and 1 which will be accessible to the public, containing condensed points with information which will also be available in tutorials.</p> <p>ii) XC asks who will manage this? JT says she and LG will manage, and says forum's main aim is for posting information for all members to create total transparency of all important information.</p> <p>iii) MC makes a distinction between the content of the forum and business packaging; forum will not really for administrative questions, e.g. queries about expenses, which should be emailed directly to JT or LG. Forum will be used as active live discussion forum. Times will be set and circulated for live discussions on website.</p> <p>iv) GH describes the template for the website's homepage, emphasising the need for the tutorials area to be clear, simple, and open for discussion.</p>	
<b>3.2</b>	<p><b>Phase 2: Discussion Forum</b> to consist of multiple discussion threads, moderated, alternatives. Suggests looking at <a href="http://www.artandarchitecture.org.uk">http://www.artandarchitecture.org.uk</a> as a model for discussion forum.</p> <p>i) JK asks how spam mail is to be sorted? MC says there will be a registration process installed, and the site will be kept only partly open. Only MILE members will be able to add information.</p> <p>ii) SM suggests one discussion starting point should be collating all partners' knowledge, and that this should be then linked to any useful examples, so that input is separate from work structure. MC agrees that website must have some facility to extract external suggestions / contact. SM says he has seen similar sites, which grow organically. GH notes that one of the editorial tasks is to extract this material and input it as separate groups to create a body of material under useful headings. JT asks all members to send in any existing guides so MILE can study and progress from these, rather than repeat them.</p>	

iii) XC asks if the forum will also be organised by WPS? GH confirms that the topics will be reflected from WPS. MC adds that these will be structured under the 3 themes of the MILE proposal, for forms, to demonstrate completion of goals, and to act as a monitoring device for MILE.

iv) ST suggests adding a telephone conference facility. GH adds that on OPEN DRAMA – an EU project he worked on – ‘chat’ facility was very effective, resulting in a useful piece of text which had practical use, and notes that audio recordings are also good. SM says that video recordings are more appealing than text or audio; GH agrees, suggesting that video could be used for some specialised topics and tutorials, however audio is a very much cheaper facility. JT asks all partners if they think conference calls would be a good way to work, say scheduled for once a month? SM flags coordination problems inherent with conference calling. AP asks what the protocol will be. JT says minutes will be posted on the website at once, and comments will be invited – for a set time – for consideration next time. FB suggests the possibility of setting a termination time for the discussions, and discussion threads.

v) JT says she has deliberately scheduled only three seminars in each work package, therefore the discussion forums – conference calling etc – will be very important, and better to fit into partners’ time.

vi) AP voices concern that there are possibly too many competing channels? GH says each will be used in distinct ways, e.g. audio only used for seminars, to ensure clarity of which is used where. JT acknowledges Skype could be a possibility, and seconds FB’s suggestion of having a clear cut-off time for discussion threads. SM notes that Skype is difficult to coordinate with more than 4 partners, as the echo factor is disruptive. GH affirms that typed chat is probably easier; SM notes it is very useful for workshopping. SS suggest the key to getting decisions from discussions is having a mechanism to decide what questions you’re answering.

vii) JT says re WP2, start a running list of all existing forums for any archive, plus all administrative functions that any image archive needs to fulfil, which can then be mapped against existing standards, schemas and software, to direct MILE’s study. SS clarifies that partners present information which MILE packages, represents and redistributes? JT and PK confirm.

viii) XC asks, what is IPTC doing? ST explains they have started working on a project which is scheduled for Spring with heritage, stock, emotion etc. XC stresses the need for MILE to know what IPTC is doing to avoid crossover and collect questions. HB asks for clarification as to whether photo metadata conference is attached to CEPIC conference, and suggests this would be useful for MILE partners to attend.

**ALL PARTNERS**

**3.3 Phase 3: Orphan Images** area will consist of objectives, scenarios – what will MILE do, and how will the public use it? – model, implementation. Active contribution needs to be made to this area.

i) FB asks when website will be running? MC says within a month. The discussion forum will need to be consolidated. AP asks if we can make any decisions today re communications between meetings? (because it would be useful to have the forum up and running as soon as possible), and suggests setting this up as a priority, as it will be most useful.

GH suggests the time limit on comments as two weeks? and proposes the end of January as deadline for all discussions regarding the forum area.

ii) AP asks for contact details for all members. GH confirms that SSL can set

**SSL**

**ALL PARTNERS  
BAL**

**3.3**

the mail up first.

iii) JT says BAL will put together a list of questions, with SSL, and mail it to all partners.

iv) SM proposes that a shared calendar would be useful; PK notes that there are various programmes already in existence which are worth researching.

v) JT says re WP2, BAL will send a questionnaire to all partners, within the next few weeks. Partners can add their own questions to this, and also forward it to interested parties in the interest of building up a MILE database. Then the 1<sup>st</sup> seminar can look at these responses, mapping business functions against use, and showcase systems suggested by partners. JT asks for partners' feedback, adding that any presentations, by partners or other authorities, will also be useful, and asks for any more questions from partners.

vi) AP asks who decides who does what, and can we offer our involvement if not already included in specific WPS? JT says of course, please let her know.

vi) SS proposes the use of knowing if the focus is on the backend of data fields, or front end, or both? JT confirms both; this to be covered in metadata classification.

vii) JT also confirms that all partners are eligible for travel and accommodation expenses, only guest members will not be paid costs. JT lists two guest members – Murtha Bacca from Getty, and Amalyah Keshet from The Israel Museum – and other interested parties include MDA, Tom Morgan from NPG, WATCH on Orphan Works (at Reading University UK), Naomi Korn (author of MINERVA Copyright guide).

viii) XC asks if we can find out what standards CEPIC or BAPLA use for cataloguing? As it would be good to know what big companies use, and what works and should be used. SS says yes can use BAPLA. SM also suggests using ALI's system.

ix) HB notes that general lines, not just cultural ones, would be useful; SS says stock libraries just invent their own systems. GH notes that the software enabling these systems is crucial to know.

x) JT says BAL has scheduled MILE events around other seminars, e.g. CEPIC in Florence, which will also be useful for guest members who will be attending CEPIC.

xi) ST stresses the importance of describing how classification is used, how it works; transparency of process is essential in metadata feeds, especially regarding questions generated through the forum. MC agrees, though noting that this is more an issue of general use, and asks what scenarios does MILE envisage? What does MILE envisage the information generated by the project will be used for? For exchange, or more structured use?

xii) XC suggests that the structure of headers for captioning is very important as regards key words, and advises making questions feasible from both ends.

xiii) JT stresses the need to focus on mapping questions against existing schemas, and reiterates the format of MILE sending out questionnaires to all partners, which partners contribute to / answer / circulate, and return for MILE to collate responses.

xiv) SS asks what is most important, and practical, to standardise? As there are various key words which it is very important to use. Also, licensing issues and IPR must be considered (these are enormous fields, projects in themselves). Stresses need to remember automatic licensing issues – as in

**BAL**

**BAL  
BAL**

**ALL PARTNERS  
ALL PARTNERS**

**ALL PARTNERS**

**ALL PARTNERS**

**BAL  
ALL PARTNERS  
ALL PARTNERS  
BAL**

	<p>the PLUS SCHEME – are these coverable here too, as they would dovetail with these issues?</p> <p>xv) AP asks if it is possible to put metadata classification into 2 separate categories, for format, and content. GH says this is likely to be descriptive metadata, technical metadata, and IPR. SS defines descriptive metadata as keyword or title.</p> <p>xvi) JK says, as a lawyer, he would rather avoid having to give real-time advice.</p>	
	<p><b>WORK PACKAGE 3 (WP3) – METADATA SEARCH AND RETRIEVAL PACKAGE</b></p>	
<p><b>4.1</b></p>	<p><b>Metadata Search and Retrieval</b></p> <p>i) JT says the accessibility of metadata takes into consideration the aims of the end user, as shown in SM's chart showing 'Intelligence' within his presentation. This area is split into three main sections: identifying problems, exploring avenues and creating resolutions. Again, BAL will put questions together for partners to think on and answer utilising their specific areas of expertise.</p> <p>ii) SS asks if there is a separate translation issue, as to why translation systems are not used as widely? JT confirms that yes, many current translation systems are not thought to be effective, and therefore are not used. AE mentions Margaret Thatcher's visit to Japan as an example of the potential problems with translation systems. AC points to the STILETTO PROJECT, which has a translation system. JT confirms the need for an area to showcase this, and the software used. HB suggests that perhaps all partners could provide details of any translation systems they use.</p> <p>iii) ST recommends metadata entered by country – but that language captions should be inherent, and states, as an example, the case of an American company buying a Danish company, which entailed lots of translatory work. Therefore ST suggests making decisions on vocabulary. JT agrees, highlights that WP1 feeds into this area of WP2 regarding headers and fields used to build classified thesaurus, and flags the problem of 'free text'. MC suggests that any fields with single terms are easier than those with context, and that keywords are easier to work with than captions.</p> <p>iv) SS, SM, MHS and AE disagree. MHS says key wording, not classification, should go into WP2 and WP3. AE says free text can create problems, and points to the International Standard ISO 5127 Section 7, which contains a basic vocabulary (En / Fr terms, English definitions) of several dozen legal practices and legal arrangement terms that may appear relevant for documentation institutions, pictures libraries and agencies etc. These entries may prove a help for institutions which are not at all knowledgeable so far about the legal dimensions of acquiring, distributing, and using images under the aspect of copyright law. A British Standard BS DD 247 Documentation; Vocabulary (1998) also exists with many useful entries, but it has no explicit section on legal terminology. SM confirms that automatic translation systems are very difficult and such bad results that ALI has had to abandon using them. Translation always needs a human editor. JT agrees with MHS on keywords, which are also useful for search and result, and asks if all partners are happy with the 3 seminar structure of WP2?</p> <p>v) FB asks if search questions will be based on keywords. JT cites PK's earlier recommendation, to think of the end user, and MC and GH's interest</p>	<p><b>ALL PARTNERS</b></p>

<p>in folksonomies. She highlights the Steve Museum Project at Pasadena conference, which encouraged the public to tag key words themselves; 72% of these results were new terms for the image holders' database. GH cites a similar example, of The Metropolitan's image of an automaton of Diana and Actaeon which received 82% of external data. Also, that a Google Image worker has invented an interactive two-player competition for obtaining external data, in which a pair of players will post terms and receive points for each new term posted, allowing Google Images to build up their terms of reference and classification. SM suggests that such a level of key words will be very low; GH acknowledges that initially, yes, but these terms expand and grow with use. GH also knows Steve Museum very well; JT says this is a useful contact.</p> <p>vi) SM asks if this system will use a light box? PK says the context of the user is quite important. SM agrees, says some users register with a personal profile, which can then be mapped to obtain results.</p> <p>vii) JT asks for any further issues? PK asks if this will be human search and result, or machine search and result? JT says both, as MILE needs to consider all key words. SS notes the importance of considering significant differences between user groups. MHS asks if there is a dissemination aspect regarding the WPS? More instruments could be thought of for WP subject topics, and also fact sheets. JT confirms that work within these WPS should feed into discussion packages. Making these available on the website will open it up to a wider audience so they can be taken to other seminars and conferences, and MILE results can be also presented at other events. GH notes that tutorials also fulfil this role.</p>	<p><b>ALL PARTNERS</b></p>
<p><b>5.0 WORK PACKAGE 4 (WP4) METADATA IPR DISCUSSION</b></p>	
<p><b>5.1. Metadata IPR Discussion</b></p> <p>i) JT says this is the biggest WP, and again, its structure is the same as the other WPS. JT also notes that the aim of the Orphan Works Database (OPD) should be to recommend the necessity for new legislation regarding Orphan Works, and to decide how this would work. The Database will hold any information already known about these works, but it also will highlight the problem of showing images without Copyright (©).</p> <p>ii) SS asks if the point of OPD is to create easier access to these images? JT confirms this; states that the aim of the OPD is to increase the use, trade and exchange of Orphan Works (OW), adding to their metadata if possible to increase access to them. The importance of taking Due Diligence (DD) will be highlighted, and MILE will produce a guide for practice on all possible © scenarios regarding the use of OW.</p> <p>iii) HB suggests initiating a discussion on the legislation regarding OW. MHS says a high level group, appointed by the Commission, has already published its first report on the technical position of OW, but the harmonisation of the EU member states still needs to be carried out.</p> <p>iv) SM raises the question of protection of OW, as methods and procedures of protection are equally as important as the accessibility of OW grows. JT acknowledges this is important, citing methods of hindering access, such as time bombing and watermarking images, but also asks if these are really effective enough? SM believes that although image pirates are extremely knowledgeable about subverting all hindrance methods, the regular end user is fearful of ©, and that stopping the majority of piracy is sufficient. ST cites cases in which large companies are being sued simply due to their lack of knowledge, e.g. EMI. Search methods like PicScout can also be held liable,</p>	

and sometimes companies employ website technicians who simply breach copyright by using images illegally. HB notes that PicScout is a very useful tool. ST also cites cases where large newspaper corporations grab pictures of celebrities from websites without © clearance, and that he thinks better protection is needed too.

v) MC asks how will MILE decide which issues to focus on, as there seem to be so many in this area? ST suggests looking at what Gowers Review says on OW, and in particular US legislation. MC finds Gowers Review ambiguous, and suggests that MILE should propose what the British Government's position ought to be. JT confirms that the Commission thought MILE's focus on OW was a real strength, and the EU is hoping that one of MILE's results will be a list of recommendations on OW. MC states the necessity for such a list to be very well written. ST has heard that, because of book digitisation, the EU is already pushing this through. ST says in Sweden, common practice is for each user to bring up their own system, e.g. Wikistamp, which makes it easier for the artist.

vi) JT says there are two different aspects: collective management, and DRM system, and MILE need to specify which system will be best for metadata. SS notes that these are very different in the different EU member states, but clarity of the suggestions will be very helpful.

vii) JK suggests creating a template showing how © license can be transferred; this wouldn't be difficult to have in a standard format. HB demurs that there is not unifying © factor, and that better cooperation (between member states) is needed.

viii) ST says the USA's way of selling is different to Europe's, and therefore it's a different situation with more complex systems. JK agrees that these are two different law systems, and also flags the issue of Moral Rights. ST asks if the USA model can be used more by the EU. JT suggests that demystifying existing © tools, e.g. referring to the Berne Convention, and exploring this through the EU would be useful for all partners, and also as a discussion group for everyone's use.

vix) GH asks which layer of © is an OW? ST confirms this as publishable level; says that Sweden has a very different system, that there is little knowledge, and refers again to the USA's way of using / reusing OW and ©. JK inserts that the USA often infringe Moral Rights of the Author. ST says the issue of OW needs to be addressed quickly. SW says permission to publish is always necessary, otherwise the author and / or © Holder loses money, control etc.

x) GH asks how much of BAL is made up of OW? JT estimates 10%,

xi) ST asks how do we know what the © is if no dates are available for an image? HB says BAL encourages a culture of penalising newspapers for unaccredited use, and asks what percentage of ALI's library is OW? SM is not sure. SS says the big problem concerning the USA's model is if the USA simply take and use. XC asks how MILE can use it, then? ST explains the system of how the Artists Benevolent Fund receives money for use of OW. SS asks if IPR includes different licensing models? And wonders how far the cultural sector is looking at subscription models.

xii) JT suggests Educational Fair Use might be a useful licensing model? In addition to Creative Commons, these might be useful in making recommendations and guidelines. BAL will produce a series of questions for partners' response, which will be especially helpful in reducing this huge WP to its key objectives. AG agrees that a hierarchy is necessary, which can be

made up of two to three topics.

xiii) SM asks if a book is one of the planned outcomes of MILE? As clearly this project will create a huge body of useful material. HB wonders if CEPIC would be interested? SM says consolidating the big issues covered in the WPS would be good; IPR is such a complex and interesting issue that this would make a helpful manual. JT says BAL will consider this.

xiv) HB suggests that IPR would make a project in itself.

xv) JK notes also as regards translation, derivative rights need to be taken into consideration.

xvi) JT proposes that the amount of work in WP4 needs to be reduced.

xvii) ST suggests logging each image with a unique number which originates from the camera or scanner used, and which could be created automatically. AE cites ISBN as an example; SW cites the Registration of Digital Items. SS says that one issue regarding this is the role of the Creators / © Holders / individual photographers, and asks how important their particular identity is to picture libraries? There was a project on this topic – which failed due to lack of funds – but it is still a discussion which needs to be had. AE cites a similar (EU) project, called Digital Object Identifier, which focused on the problem of distinguishing generations of photographs for example, but similarly did not go far enough. ST says it would be different working out the number system he suggests, as it would not be similar to an ISBN; the unique number should originate from the camera or scanner and not be created by human input. This would ensure its individuality. Of course, manufacturers would need to be asked, this is just an idea. AG posits that this would be fine for new pictures, but old pictures have to be dealt with too.

xviii) SS asks who should push forward such a project, the Commission, or the photographers themselves? Who would best and most usefully create this? Also, information which points back to the company or agency where the picture originates from needs to be retained in some way. ST affirms that the creator's identity is necessary. PK asks if this is the creator of the photograph, or of the original work? ST confirms this is the photographer; photographs have 50 years ©. Date of creator's death is necessary for ©.

xix) SS says that for art libraries, the opposite is true. Images which are out of © still need protection, and we can't just rely on ©, because when © expires some images would become freely available. The more automated the system becomes, picture libraries move more into the public domain. HB says that this is too large a subject for BAL to take on; MC suggests that MILE should recommend this to the Commission to take up. ST agrees, says this would be very helpful. HB says, as would some clarification on Open Source and Creative Commons.

xx) MC posits that not everyone in the cultural community seems keen on asserting ©. Museums for example are very loath to do so, through the issue of public interest. HB cites Getty and the Metropolitan as examples. JT suggests that surely this goes against the common interests of all museums, who need to make money from selling reproduction / © rights. SS suggests MILE provides a guide to new libraries from museums collections.

xxi) JT suggests HB explains details of BAL's re-enactment of the Corel Case to partners. HB gives details; May 3<sup>rd</sup> 2007, Queen Mary's College, various speakers and experts are coming for it including Mary Beth Peters from Washington. It will act as a showcase for different countries views, and as it is a very important issue, will hopefully generate positive publicity. GH asks if this will be recorded in some way? HB confirms that it will, and that

	<p>there will be a judges' verdict at the close.  xxii) MSH and AE highlight a conference to be held in Berlin in February 2007. See <a href="http://www.eudico.de">www.eudico.de</a> for more details.</p>	
<p><b>6.0</b></p>	<p><b>CLOSE</b>  JT thanks all partners for their input and attendance, says BAL will pull together lists of questions, information on the Corel Case re-enactment which will be sent to all partners by the end of January, The next meeting is scheduled to take place around CEPIC in June 2007.</p>	<p><b>BAL</b></p>