



WORKING PAPER

No 15

EU grey literature

Long-term preservation,
access, and discovery



EU grey literature

Long-term preservation,
access, and discovery

Cedefop working papers are unedited documents, available only electronically. They make results of Cedefop's work promptly available and encourage further discussion.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.

It can be accessed through the Europa server (<http://europa.eu>).

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2012

ISBN 978-92-896-1132-9

ISSN 1831-2403

doi: 10.2801/94634

© European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, 2012

All rights reserved.

The **European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training** (Cedefop) is the European Union's reference centre for vocational education and training. We provide information on and analyses of vocational education and training systems, policies, research and practice. Cedefop was established in 1975 by Council Regulation (EEC) No 337/75.

Europe 123, 570 01 Thessaloniki (Pylea), GREECE
PO Box 22427, 551 02 Thessaloniki, GREECE
Tel. +30 2310490111, Fax +30 2310490020
E-mail: info@cedefop.europa.eu
www.cedefop.europa.eu

Christian F. Lettmayr, *Acting Director*
Hermann Nehls, *Chair of the Governing Board*

The **European Community and Associated Institutions Library Cooperation Group (Eurolib)** was established on the initiative of the Secretary-General of the European Parliament and met for the first time in June 1988. Eurolib is the oldest cooperation group among EU bodies. It meets regularly to promote a coordinated approach to professional library issues, such as bibliographical procedures, library and document delivery services regarding European integration.

Cedefop / Eurolib working papers are intended to help and guide information professionals when dealing with EU documents and/or EU-related subjects as part of their library or documentation centre activities.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the working group and not those of the European bodies represented in the Eurolib group. Eurolib working papers are technical documents designed to provide better understanding of European Union documents and publications. Eurolib raises awareness of the contribution libraries and information services make to the work of the institutions they serve. It aims to improve efficiency of institutional libraries through professional contacts, including staff exchanges.

Foreword

There is probably no greater ambition than to perpetuate our rich cultural heritage. It is therefore in full consciousness of our responsibility towards past and future generations ... that we have approached our mission.

So begins *The new Renaissance* (Niggeman et al., 2011), the report from the Comité des sages – Reflection Group on Bringing Europe's Cultural Heritage Online.

Although we cannot claim to aspire to the ambitious target set by their report, we can play our part in ensuring that the political and administrative heritage of the *European idea* conceived by Jean Monnet and his fellow visionaries is preserved for future generations.

We are conscious, that without political will at the highest level, we cannot achieve a perfect solution, but if we alert both our colleagues and institution policy-makers to the loss of EU information and data, and provide examples of best practice, we can, perhaps, improve the current situation, where black holes and information silos abound.

Acknowledgement

This Cedefop / Eurolib working paper has been prepared under the responsibility of:

- Carol Bream (European Commission) rapporteur;
- Isabel Moran (Committee of the Regions);
- Anne Waniart (European Commission);
- Gabriella Zana (European Parliament).

The working group on *EU grey literature* would like to also thank Jocelyn Collonval (European Commission), Jordi Gasull (European Commission), Evangelia Kounouraki (European University Institute), Andree Regnier (Publications Office) for their support and advice.

Eurolib Presidency 2010-15:

- President: Marc Willem, Head of Library and Documentation, Cedefop (Thessaloniki);
- Vice-President: Milvia Priano, European Parliament (Brussels);
- Vice-President: Cosimo Monda, EIPA (Maastricht).

Table of contents

Foreword.....	1
Acknowledgement.....	2
Summary.....	4
Part 1: Mission	7
1.1. Background.....	7
1.2. Issues.....	8
1.3. Objective	9
Part 2: Methodology	10
Part 3: Results.....	11
3.1. Survey	11
3.2. Repositories	12
3.3. Copyright, literary and artistic rights.....	14
3.4. Service level agreement between the Publications Office and <i>local</i> print shops	15
3.5. Studies in the Commission Historical Archives: deposit and metadata	15
3.6. Other sources.....	17
3.7. EDC network working group on electronic archives	18
3.8. Selected EU-funded programmes on repositories and open access.....	19
3.9. Selected finding aids	19
Part 4: Conclusions and recommendations	21
4.1. Conclusions.....	21
4.2. Next steps	23
4.3. Recommendations	24
Selective bibliography	27
Abbreviations	30
Annex A – Survey questionnaire and responses	31
Annex B – DG Enterprise manual of budgetary and financial procedures.....	33
Annex C – Form to accompany studies deposited in Historical Archive.....	34
Annex D – Extract from CoR studies contract.....	40
Annex E – Preliminary data collected prior to the creation of the working group.....	43
Annex F – Minutes of an informal meeting of staff from the Secretariat General, DG Communication and DG Education and Culture	55

Summary

The preservation of the historical memory of the development of the European Union and its policies, which have helped to mould European history for almost 60 years, has never been more important in a world of rapid change. The growth of 'fast' publication of documents in print or on the various websites of Europa, with no long-term repository or stable URL, not deposited in the EU Bookshop, or in the repositories that form the basis of the registers of the institutions, is alarming.

Librarians traditionally preserved resources. Many of these resources have lasting value and significance and should be protected and preserved for current and future generations. The issues to be considered are legal, technical and, particularly in the case of the EU institutions ⁽¹⁾, organisational.

A working group on EU grey literature was set up during the annual Eurolib meeting in Brussels on 3-4 May 2010. We were motivated by our experience as EU institution information professionals of searching, often fruitlessly, for documents or publications of all kinds to satisfy requests from both EU staff, researchers and the wider public.

The working group set out to build on and validate information already gathered ⁽²⁾ on an ad hoc basis. The aim was to identify:

- (a) gaps between the current repositories;
- (b) weaknesses in workflow and definition of the various documents involved;
- (c) examples of solutions and good practice.

We sent out a survey to all Eurolib members asking them to identify their existing workflow and examples of good practice that ensure that our administrative, cultural and political heritage is kept for future generations and can provide greater transparency on the expenditure of the EU institutions.

The survey ⁽³⁾ revealed some misunderstanding of the definition of the term *grey literature*. In some cases replies referred to collections of grey literature relevant to the work of that institution but not produced by or for EU institutions.

Nevertheless, the results confirmed that:

- (a) no institution has a complete workflow covering grey literature;
- (b) there is no mandatory deposit for most of the institutions;

⁽¹⁾ The phrase 'EU institution(s)' is used throughout the working paper to refer to all institutions, bodies and agencies of the European Union.

⁽²⁾ See Annex E preliminary data gathered prior to creation of working group.

⁽³⁾ See Annex A survey questionnaire and responses.

- (c) only half of the institutions have an in-house workflow to ensure long-term preservation and access.

Examples of best practices emerge:

- (a) where publication, archive and library departments work together in close cooperation, or are grouped in a single department, e.g. at Eurofound;
- (b) where there is an established workflow covering all types of studies, reports and evaluations, e.g. as described in DG Enterprise Manual of Budgetary and Financial procedures ⁽⁴⁾;
- (c) where a copyright clause is included in standard contracts.

We apologise for any imbalance between the information pertaining to the European Commission and that of the other institutions in this report. The Commission is the most diverse and decentralised of the institutions, with significant differences in workflow adopted by various DGs.

While the working group has been attempting to identify the needs of information seekers for long-term access to information, related initiatives to encourage or support access to information have been taken or have continued to mature.

Of note are the following:

- (a) press release No 2/2009 from the European Ombudsman (2009). *Ombudsman criticises Commission for inadequate register of documents*. <http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu/en/press/release.faces/en/3738/html.bookmark>;
- (b) press release IP/11/343 from the European Commission (2011). *The European Commission proposes to extend rules to all EU institutions*. <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/11/343&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>;
- (c) open letter from Transparency calling on Members of the EP (MEPs) (2011). *MEPs called upon to protect EU transparency*. http://www.access-info.org/documents/Access_Docs/Advancing/EU/Letter_MEPs_28_Jan_2011.pdf;
- (d) press release No 17/2011 from the European Ombudsman (2011). *Ombudsman calls for more pro-active transparency in the EU*. <http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu/en/press/release.faces/en/10876/html.bookmark>;
- (e) *Parliament's resolution* of 5 May 2010 on the discharge procedure for the 2008 financial year, No 136, p. 23 *in which it asks for a central inter-institutional database to be established for external studies commissioned by European institutions*. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri>

⁽⁴⁾ See Annex B DG Enterprise Manual of Budgetary and Financial Procedures.

=OJ:L:2010:252:FULL:EN:PDF. As a result in November 2011 a Commission Working Group on Studies was set up;

- (f) Legal Deposit Inter-institutional Working Group Report to the Management Board of the Publications Office (PO) of the European Union. *Preservation of EU publications heritage*;
- (g) European Documentation Centres (EDC) Working Group on electronic archives;
- (h) PO Bookshop, RECORD, CELLAR and EUROVOC thesaurus interoperability projects;
- (i) recently formed Inter-institutional Metadata Management Committee (IMMC);
- (j) Working Group on Collaborative Thesauri;
- (k) Walters, T.; Skinner, K. (2011). *New roles for new times: digital curation for preservation*. http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/hrnt_digital_curation17mar11.pdf.

Our conclusions and recommendations focus on:

- (a) statutory workflow;
- (b) cooperation between departments and institutions;
- (c) repositories and registers (new or existing) for deposit of publications and documents currently 'falling through the cracks';
- (d) harmonised metadata for search;
- (e) tools for (federated) search;
- (f) finding the best arguments to gain political support for the above.

Volatility of grey literature is a subject of concern to both librarians and archivists alike. Policy-makers should also be worried: ignorance or loss of information and knowledge has a critical impact on policy research and the resulting quality of EU policies and legislation.

Part 1

Mission

1.1. Background

The *working group on EU grey literature* was set up to study the current situation related to long-term access to all EU institution publications and documents with the goal to provide a set of best practices and guidelines to guarantee long-term preservation of and access to EU institution output.

The subject is that all departments within the European institutions produce numerous documents, which are not stored in any database or repository. This output (print, visual, audio, on-line) is not consistently:

- (a) available from the EU Publications' Office (PO), even where an official identification number (ID) has been issued;
- (b) deposited in the internal or external document repositories and registers.

Examples include:

- (a) reports;
- (b) evaluations and studies carried out by external consultants;
- (c) other deliverables resulting from projects funded by the institutions;
- (d) documents only made available on the web;
- (e) conference and meeting material;
- (f) speeches given by EU staff;
- (g) books or articles published by EU staff in various professional and scientific journals. Many staff members are unaware of the EU institution copyright guidelines on how to handle the legal issues associated with author and publisher rights ⁽⁵⁾.

Grey literature is a field in library and information science that deals with the production, distribution and access to multiple document types produced on all levels of government, academics, business, and organization in electronic and print formats not controlled by commercial publishing, i.e. where publishing is not the primary activity of the producing body (Greynet, 2011).

However, the definition of grey literature has evolved over the years. [...] regarding the multitude of other documents that circulate outside conventional

⁽⁵⁾ Lack of distinction between what belongs to the Commission (work for a publication is carried out within working hours), and what belongs solely to the author (work carried out in own time). Some authors would be happy to deposit their work with their institutions, but currently there is no repository. Copies might be deposited in local files, on local servers, or even on Europa, but, through lack of any preservation policy, they are not permanently or consistently accessible.

publishing, lack of commercial control raises real problems [...] when it comes to locating or acquiring them. The lack of commercial control [...] often implies a lack of bibliographical control ... these documents are often inadequately referenced in catalogues and databases, so that searches [...] require specialised knowledge on sources and grey circuits [...]. Grey literature can best be described as *fugitive literature* or the ‘stuff that falls through the cracks’ (Farace et al., 2010).

EU grey literature can therefore be categorised as:

- (a) published in any media format;
- (b) not covered by the rules and procedures applied to administrative documents, e.g. the Commission E-DOMEC family of tools;
- (c) not governed by the PO workflow;
- (d) failing to follow the PO workflow despite having an official ID.

All library staff regularly face challenges in tracing one or other of the above. There are no clear boundaries between what is subject to internal administrative rules ⁽⁶⁾ and what is considered to be an official publication ⁽⁷⁾.

1.2. Issues

In the EU alone 3 billion euros worth of digital information is lost every year (European Commission, 2010).

Why should the EU institutions ensure that there are mandated repositories and a well-defined properly regulated workflow to cover all documents and publications issued by EU institutions, of whatever nature or origin?

Cultural and political heritage

- (a) Semi-official documents trace the development of EU policies and decision-making powers;
- (b) They ‘add flesh to the bare bones’ of legislation, placing it in its historical context.

Openness and transparency for EU citizens

- (a) *‘Freedom of access to information’ is needed for civil society to act effectively and hold decision-makers accountable* (Transparency International, 2011);

⁽⁶⁾ Internal documents are covered by a legal requirement and rules that are applied from the time a document appears in its first draft until it is discarded or stored in the Historical Archives in print or electronic format.

⁽⁷⁾ Publications with official IDs don’t always arrive in the PO digital repository. Full coverage will not be achieved without imposing a legal deposit requirement, hence the establishment of the Inter-institutional working group on legal deposit.

- (b) *'Active transparency' of EU institutions promotes citizens' participation in the EU decision-making process* (Transparency International, 2011).

Ease of access to EU information

- (a) *Although there is a wealth of material available, it is not always obvious which source is most appropriate or how information can be found* (European Information Association, 2011);
- (b) Provision should be made for long-term access to e-published material no longer available on Europa and to print studies and reports quoted in other literature;

Legal aspects

- (a) Documents the basis for Commission *acquis*;
- (b) EU institutions have an obligation to justify spending;
- (c) Studies and reports must be accessible and demonstrate value for money to satisfy access requests from MEPs and citizens.

1.3. Objective

The objective of the working group is to provide a set of best practices and guidelines to achieve long-term preservation and access to all types of documents in the EU environment. The guidelines do not focus on specific technical solutions, but rather on requirements for efficient information management to ensure:

- (a) transparency and access to information for EU citizens;
- (b) better informed officials;
- (c) efficient and economic use of information resources;
- (d) knowledge sharing;
- (e) overview of the purchase of studies and reports to verify that almost identical studies are not purchased several times under different contracts.

Recommendations should help:

- (a) incorporate standard workflow in an institution-wide manual of procedures;
- (b) clarify correct use of existing repositories for each type of document;
- (c) fill gaps in the current network of repositories;
- (d) EU institutions take responsibility for preserving their own information, because a situation where EU documents are preserved partially and/or only in external repositories is not acceptable.

Part 2

Methodology

The working group decided to pool and build on information already available to group members working in libraries, publication and related departments. We wanted to find out whether problems we come across in our daily work of providing information services are common to all institutions. We also wanted to collect information from EU Information Networks.

We looked at:

- (a) which documents (print or electronic) are currently not covered by archiving/long-term storage and accessibility procedures;
- (b) if there are any administrative procedures, practices or guidelines in place to ensure long-term preservation and access;
- (c) which EU or related institutions, bodies and organisations have formal rules and strategies in place that cover all 'literature' produced by their institution;
- (d) what is the role of information professionals in these initiatives and if and how their skills and knowledge are used;
- (e) how the administrative workflow can be improved by applying existing rules consistently;
- (f) repositories that could be made available.

A survey was sent to all Eurolib members, contacts in libraries of the EU institutions and publications correspondents in EU organisations.

The group examined the various categories of literature concerned and then set out to draw up recommendations on actions to remove barriers to long-term identification and access.

At the request of the EDC the rapporteur joined the Working Group on Electronic Repositories. This was seen as a practical way for both groups to share experience.

Part 3

Results

3.1. Survey

Annex A of this publication contains the questionnaire and a summary of replies to the survey.

The working group decided not approach webmasters, because a differently worded survey would be required.

Nevertheless, prior discussion with a Commission official responsible for the management of DG Information Society website corroborated the results of the survey (see section 3.2 *Repositories* below).

Twenty seven replies had been received from a reasonably wide sample of EU institution and associated libraries.

Key results are:

- (a) no institution has a complete workflow covering grey literature;
- (b) there is no mandatory deposit for most of the institutions;
- (c) only half of the institutions have an in-house workflow to ensure long-term preservation and access;
- (d) the workflow depends too heavily on all parties concerned completing all steps;
- (e) a lack of provision for permanent repositories, coherent metadata, digital curation, and long-term preservation exists (Grönewald et al., 2011, pp. 236-248.);
- (f) some institutions assume that the library receives copies of all types of documents and publications. This isn't the case where a workflow remains incomplete due to human error, e.g. individuals forget or were never informed about deposit requirements);
- (g) all respondents want a solution to the problem of *fugitive literature* but no one has a fail-safe solution;
- (h) only two replies had been received from PO publications correspondents: DG Employment and DG IT. Should we conclude that publications correspondents do not recognise the role they play in the 'publication to preservation' chain?

The following examples of best practice were suggested by respondents:

(a) Eurofound

In-house cooperation between publication services, archives and library results in archiving of physical copy, storage of electronic documents using

document and record management software; creation of metadata in the library catalogue.

(b) **Cedefop**

The library carefully tracks in house generated grey literature. However, documents produced by Cedefop with official IDs are not necessarily in the Bookshop repository and in the past the links have broken when website was reorganised.

(c) **DG Enterprise**

The DG Manual of Budgetary and Financial Procedures describes the following steps: Deposit of all studies and reports in the library in addition to any other mandatory repository; Metadata registered by the library in ECLAS to describe and locate these reports and studies.

(d) **European University Institute**

stressed the importance of: a clear workflow; political support, even more important than the workflow itself.

3.2. Repositories

Measures should be taken to ensure future access to digital content. It is important to make a distinction between repositories and search tools or portals. The latter provide metadata describing items and linking to repositories or other locations.

The following repositories belong to EU institutions and are considered reliable:

(a) **EU Bookshop** (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>) – Digital Library of PO – publications have a permalink and, more recently, a DOI. There were 83.344 titles in the EU Bookshop as of December 2010⁽⁸⁾;

(b) **EC E-DOMEC ARES** family of document repositories – with a registry number;

(c) **EU institution registers** (<http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs>) is not a repository but a database of references to documents);

(d) **Pubsys JRC digital repository**

(<http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository>) – using D-space (<http://www.dspace.org>) open source software enabling open sharing of content that spans organisations, continents and time;

⁽⁸⁾ EU Bookshop Backoffice Reporting, 14.11.2011.

(e) **Historical Archives of EU**

(<http://www.eui.eu/Research/HistoricalArchivesOfEU>) in the European University Institute in Florence;

(f) **Dorie** (<http://ec.europa.eu/dorie>) contains legal acts, minutes of meetings, articles and press releases, speeches by European leaders and internal Commission working documents and notes. Provides an information sheet for each document, as well as the document itself unless access is restricted by copyright;

(g) European Parliament has no integrated process for grey literature. **EP Studies, notes and library briefings** (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/studies/catalog.do?language=EN>) are available on the Parliament's website, stored in the internal document system and listed in the library catalogue. The database also contains all documents produced by the Parliament's former Directorate-General for Research, going back to 1997. Other documents are accessed via the **EP Register** (<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegistreWeb>). There are plans to create an internal or external repository for studies in cooperation with other EU institutions;

(h) **QuickfindNet**, the Committee of the Regions – Economic and Social Committee repository for studies and speeches open to all institutions.

Do these repositories all have good document digital curation and long-term preservation policies in place? The European Parliament databases are all permanent but are not interconnected. The links are stable but there is no digital curation and long-term preservation policy. Physical copies should always be available in the library, EP archive and European University Institute, but not all are there because of an incomplete workflow. There is a plan to incorporate all types of document in the register.

The following repositories are created by organisations, other than EU institutions, and collect some types of EU information:

(a) **ESO – European Sources Online** (<http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/insrv/edc/eso>);

(b) **European Navigator** (<http://www.ena.lu/>);

(c) **Cadmus** (<http://cadmus.eui.eu>) a database of publications by the European University Institute community, supported by DSpace. Wherever possible, full-text is also provided;

(d) **AEI – Archive of European Integration** (<http://aei.pitt.edu/>) Pittsburgh, USA.

Repositories which we do not consider as viable are web archives and the growing number of databases springing up in the EU institutions. These have no permalinks, no policies for maintenance and archiving, poor metadata, and often

duplicate other sources instead of linking to a permanent reliable repository. They are not interconnected and have no system in place to facilitate federated search.

It is feasible to tag online documents for preservation and transfer them to a repository when a website is changed. But it would be better to link from web pages to a reliable repository in the first place.

At the end of a Commission mandate the websites could be archived along with the content, but multiplying the number of sources does not solve the problem of findability nor is it an economic efficient use of IT resources.

Documents without PO identifiers, which are publicised on EU websites and later transferred to the Historical Archives risk to wait 30 years before becoming public again.

3.3. Copyright, literary and artistic rights

Pubsy has a clear privacy statement ⁽⁹⁾ for authors depositing their scientific publications.

The European Parliament framework contract includes a clause: *[...] copyright and other intellectual or industrial property rights, obtained in performance of the contract shall belong exclusively to the European Parliament [...]*.

The CoR also includes a standard clause in its contracts for studies and reports ⁽¹⁰⁾.

The PO recognises that legal deposit is an important element to ensure long-term preservation of the EU publications heritage. The *Legal Deposit Working Group* emphasises that it is not always obvious what is included in the EU publications heritage.

Obvious are:

- (a) publications handled by the PO for authors within the EU institutions;
- (b) publications in the Official Journal.

Less obvious are:

- (a) publications of the EU institutions and EU agencies not handled by the PO;
- (b) audiovisual materials;
- (c) databases, websites, etc.

A good definition to encompass 'all' would be: every document produced by the EU institutions, either directly, or on their behalf by third parties, independent of its medium, intended for the public and disseminated by whatever means.

⁽⁹⁾ http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/res/Privacy_statement_for_PUBSY.pdf.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Annex D.

The definition should include paper and other physical media, electronic and audio-visual documents, databases and websites.

Not only should this heritage be preserved, it should also be organised using common metadata (cataloguing and preservation) standards to enable search with digital curation and long-term preservation policies.

3.4. Service level agreement between the Publications Office and *local* print shops

The service level agreement states that only material intended for internal distribution should be produced in the EU 'print shop'. This is open to interpretation. In the Commission we find examples of conference and publicity materials which are produced using print shops. In the Committees many publications, which are not published officially by the PO are on display and available for visitors to take away.

The department which orders from the print shop does not always realise that the responsibility to archive remains with the department. The staff is not always aware that the print shop does not routinely file and retain a copy.

A department which commissions a report or study should be responsible for keeping a copy of each publication produced by or ordered from external contractors unless an official ID is requested from the PO and the final document sent to the PO. The EC DG Health and Consumers publications unit confirms that the unit advises colleagues on ways to publish and disseminate information, but they are not responsible for deciding which option is chosen.

3.5. Studies in the Commission Historical Archives: deposit and metadata

All studies paid for by administrative appropriations of the Commission should be deposited in the Historical Archives of the various institutions. The example of the Commission shows how a change in the workflow had an impact on a system that had already shown weaknesses. In the Commission this does not cover studies carried out on operational appropriations.

As a result of an audit carried out by the Internal Audit Service, it was decided to remove the part of the workflow making payment of the final invoice for a study dependent on the deposit of a copy in the Historical Archives ⁽¹¹⁾. It

⁽¹¹⁾ *Objet: Etudes: suivi de l'audit du Service Audit interne. SEC (2003) 472.*

was also decided that, pending a decision on the creation of a database, with levels of access based on the sensitive nature of the study, an existing spreadsheet would continue to be used to register studies received. The metadata required are:

- (a) registration number;
- (b) title of the study;
- (c) department commissioning the study;
- (d) conditions of access.

The note specifically states that the change in workflow should not affect the obligation to deposit a copy in the Historical Archives, but that it has had precisely that effect. Until now, eight years later, no database has been created and all trace of the contents of the original CERES ⁽¹²⁾ database and its web offspring ADAM has vanished.

The standard form that should be completed by departments depositing studies with the Historical Archives is quite lengthy. Colleagues, who have used this form, find it cumbersome. The experience of colleagues working in the Historical Archives is that the form is rarely completed correctly, particularly regarding information about who may have access to the study.

The importance of including information concerning data protection is highlighted in the document *Public access to documents containing personal data after the Bavarian Lager ruling* ⁽¹³⁾ published by the European Data Protection Supervisor. This document concludes that the institutions should take a proactive approach to achieving a balance between the protection of personal data and the right of public access to information.

The form could be simplified and even be used to provide a set of information to be shared with the Central Library for entry of information in ECLAS, thus enabling search and retrieval via the Historical Archives registry number. ECLAS has the functionality to mask non-public information in the public access catalogue OPAC. This way, information can only be seen by library staff using the library management system staff client. The information in ECLAS would not reveal the content of a study, only its location. A template for this type of document already exists. It includes a field for the ARES ID ⁽¹⁴⁾, contract or other registration number and is used by several DGs, notably DG Enterprise and DG Agriculture.

⁽¹²⁾ CERES, a Mistral database contained data on all studies assigned to external contractors. The web interface was called ADAM. The database was abandoned.

⁽¹³⁾ http://www.edps.europa.eu/EDPSWEB/webdav/site/mySite/shared/Documents/EDPS/Publications/Papers/BackgroundP/11-03-24_Bavarian_Lager_EN.pdf.

⁽¹⁴⁾ http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/edoc_management/it_tools_en.htm#ares

The current form is lengthy and for the library database additional data are required, such as the name of the company or person who carried out the study; a description of the subject (EuroVoc terms could be used as descriptors); number of pages and volumes. Also, information about electronic access should be included in the form. If a study is available from a public website, the study is considered public by default.

The CoR has a similar workflow then the one described above.

3.6. Other sources

Consider this statement from one working group member: *Web archives exist and databases are springing up all over the institutions without any consideration of the main issue and purpose – making information available in a stable long-term environment. Creation of yet more databases is not the answer. We have plenty of databases but their organisation and metadata is, to say the least, not optimal. The issue is one for information experts (not IT experts). Information experts among the staff can provide guidance and advice. The need for an over all information management has never been more patently obvious. The current situation results in spending public money needlessly to reinvent the wheel.*

There is currently no legal deposit regulation for EU publications. The PO management board has moved back discussion of the recommendations in the report from the *Inter-institutional Working Group on Legal Deposit* to the agenda for the meeting in October 2011.

To rationalise the situation where documents are located in local, even personal folders, resulting in barriers to revising web pages and loss of data, DG Information Society (Jones, 2009) proposed:

- (a) permanent document file (within each DG or Commission-wide). Websites link to documents in this permanent file, and cease to link when they are no longer topical – without affecting the ‘findability’ of the documents when the website is revised or archived;
- (b) documents to remain ‘findable’ indefinitely through search mechanisms. This could be done using:
 - (i) the internal web library systems but with the disadvantage of being a local solution only and requiring additional development;
 - (ii) Commission Central Library ECLAS catalogue;
 - (iii) a new custom-developed central repository for the whole Commission with its own search tools, but why should the search mechanism be separate from ECLAS?

The best solution applicable to all EU institutions would be to provide a permanent repository for the institution, in this case the Commission. There would be a repository, and the library catalogue would contain metadata providing the information on the print and/or digital location of each document.

This is a solution similar to the current workflow for DG Enterprise ⁽¹⁵⁾ and DG Agriculture for studies. However, neither DG Enterprise nor DG Agriculture applies this workflow to documents published ad hoc on its websites; nor do they have any digital repository to cover all document types. The threat, to close DG Agriculture library illustrates the precarious nature of such a workflow.

A simple search through the 'publications' section of each EC DG on Europa server reveals a mix of publications:

- (a) with official IDs linked to the Bookshop repository;
- (b) with official IDs but with no copy in the Bookshop;
- (c) without official ID, only available via a clickable (non-permanent) link;
- (d) without official ID, only available via a clickable link to an external contractor's website.

Some organisations have partly solved this problem by harvesting documents (Jahn et al., 2010) from their websites and transferring them to their repository.

3.7. EDC network working group on electronic archives

Although the *EDC working group on electronic archives* is looking at a wider range of publications than those produced by the EU institutions, they see these publications and documents as an important core resource to which researchers and members of civil society require long-term access. They find it worrying that documents, which are of long-term importance are often untraceable after they have lost their 'newsworthiness'.

One of the concerns of 'easy to produce' Internet publications is that websites disappear and pages change. The information, that was once 'glued' to the virtual pages becomes unstuck, either by accident or because the documents are no longer considered to be current. Discarding electronic documents or making them impossible to locate, is done without a second thought.

The EDC network cannot provide a repository to harvest all publications and documents of the EU institutions, but they would like to link to the original

⁽¹⁵⁾ Annex B.

documents using a permalink. They also want to ensure that non-electronic resources can be easily identified and accessed physically where appropriate.

Restricted access to classified information is not at issue. Information seekers need to know that the information exists and where. They can then choose to make a request for access.

3.8. Selected EU-funded programmes on repositories and open access

The aim of the programmes listed below, is to build a European and worldwide infrastructure for connecting the content of existing repositories.

- (a) **Driver** (<http://www.driver-repository.eu>) aims to *explore the development of a distributed infrastructure that enables interoperability of data, resulting in a global knowledge infrastructure supporting scholarly communication of the future* (Peter et al, 2011). The principle is to link users to knowledge. Digital repositories form an integral part of the e-infrastructure for research.
- (b) **Europeana** (<http://www.europeana.eu>) is a portal that enables to explore digital resources of Europe's museums, libraries, archives and audio-visual collections.
- (c) **Openaire** (<http://www.openaire.eu>) is an open access infrastructure for research in Europe. Authors who wish to find out which repositories are available in their own country may contact their National Open Access Desk. Another possibility is to consult OpenDOAR (<http://www.opendoar.org>) the Directory of Open Access Repositories service, which lists and classifies repositories of open access academic material.

3.9. Selected finding aids

Public finding aids made available by the European institutions:

- (a) **ECLAS** (<http://ec.europa.eu/eclas>) ECLAS includes references to studies and reports use the search term 'Document type': EU study/Etude UE to retrieve these studies;
- (b) **HAEU** (<http://www.eui.eu/Research/HistoricalArchivesOfEU>) Historical Archives of the European Union preserve and make available to the public the documents coming from the European Institutions;
- (c) **ARCHIS** (http://ec.europa.eu/historical_archives) contains the European Commission historical archives, search terms only in French;

(d) **HAEL** Library OPACs and document system search tools of EU institutions other than the Commission (not all directly accessible);

(e) **Europa search engine** (<http://europa.eu/geninfo/query>).

It is true that sometimes, general search engines are often more efficient than Europa's search engine:

(a) **Google** (<http://www.google.com>);

(b) **SearchEuropa** (<http://searcheuropa.eu/>) and other search engines ⁽¹⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Blakeman, K. (2011) *Anything but Google*.
<http://www.rba.co.uk/wordpress/2011/04/06/anything-but-google-urls/>

Part 4

Conclusions and recommendations

4.1. Conclusions

There is no clear distinction between documents that should be regulated by the records management workflow and 'other' documents drawn up and/or disseminated by EU institutions. A better definition is required to decide, which documents should be deposited directly in the Historical Archives, which in the department archives using the records management workflow, and which should go to the library.

Often documents are filed in the institution's department archive boxes. These boxes are not necessarily analysed in full before deposit in the Historical Archives, which makes identification and retrieval difficult or impossible ⁽¹⁷⁾.

There are a number of questions that need to be answered:

- (a) should certain types of document be deposited both in archives and libraries using harmonised metadata;
- (b) should print copies be deposited in both places;
- (c) should the copy stored in the archives or referenced in library catalogues contain standard metadata and an identification number for retrieval;
- (d) how should documents be referenced in databases;
- (e) should standard citation become mandatory?

Currently there is a lack of harmonisation. A clear definition of each type of document would help to clarify these issues.

The situation is clouded by the fact that some publications are produced via the PO and others via the in-house publications service 'print shops'. Departments issuing requests for printing do not always realise that they are responsible for archiving the publications and documents sent to the print shops. Allocating an official ID does not guarantee that the requesting department sends the electronic copy of the publication to the PO. The PO does not have the tools in place to automatically request missing publications. Theoretically publications with official IDs are not grey literature, but the lack of bibliographic control and accessibility puts them in the same class as other grey literature.

⁽¹⁷⁾ A recent request was received from AKZO NOBEL for two reports concerning the STEP programme from the 1990s. Both are referenced on the internet, but without links to the source. The documents are not in CORDIS. RTD replied that they had no trace. Only one could be retrieved by colleagues in the Historical Archives – from an archive list for a file from RTD. The other appears to be lost or is in an unlisted file.

Close cooperation between libraries, archives, publications service-print shop, web management within the institutions, in order to cover all the documents produced and printed in-house or contracted externally, would improve the current situation and reduce duplication of effort for staff in libraries, archives, web and publishing departments. Shared metadata are essential.

Staff and management should be alerted to the value of 'fugitive literature' and become proactive, depositing documents in the library and/or institutional repository along with metadata to facilitate search. Librarians and archivists have the skills to make a valuable contribution and to design the workflow.

A mandatory checklist, indicating each step in the publishing and dissemination process, should be drawn up. One staff member per unit could be designated to send documents and publications to the appropriate repository following the checklist.

Standard contracts signed with external contractors preparing studies, evaluations, etc., for the institutions should specify copyright and deposit requirements, e.g. two print copies to be supplied, one electronic PDF copy in a format conforming to international standards for digital repositories. The European Parliament already has a reliable harmonised contract used by all parties to ensure deposit, storage, dissemination and 'rights' management.

There should be an archiving policy for web pages which includes a check that all attached documents have a permalink to one of the digital repositories or that equivalent print copies are properly referenced.

Wherever possible, collaborative or community-based approaches to digital curation are likely to be more effective and sustainable (Walters, et al., 2011). Therefore, common digital and physical repositories accessible to all staff, with different access levels to protect sensitive information, would be an advantage. These repositories need to be stable and have a complete digital curation policy.

The Commission is the most fallible institution, with multiple repositories, varying contractual terms, different definitions of studies and evaluations, some paid out of administrative appropriations, with a workflow adapted ad hoc by each DG to suit their administrative and financial circuits.

Retrospective retrieval of missing items and harvesting of information should be considered. Many tools used for metadata harvesting are now available, but harmonisation of the metadata is required to optimise search.

The IMMC is working to improve accessibility and search tools by imposing coherent metadata standards for exchange of legal information between the institutions and for re-use in public databases such as EUR-LEX (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu>). We must alert the IMMC to aspects other than those they are currently examining.

The PO has a programme to study and promote interoperability of thesauri (<http://eurovoc.europa.eu>). The EuroVoc thesaurus is available for download in 22 languages, and a new inter-institutional working group on collaborative thesauri has been convened.

We suggest that there should be a permanent repository and the library adds metadata and links to the source document via a permalink or the reference number for the print copy e.g. in ARES via the library catalogue. This permanent repository could be the ECLAS catalogue in the Commission.

We back the request for a legal deposit mandate for the PO to try to ensure that publications with official IDs are always deposited in the PO digital library.

The PO together with the Central Libraries and where relevant, the Historical Archives, could be the key actors for processing all EU publications whatever the format to make sure that at least one printed copy is always kept and that there is a well-established preservation policy for electronic publications, including e-only.

The médiathèque should be responsible for audio and video recordings and photographs.

A policy for electronic, print, and multimedia publications is vital. We must always remember that users want information per se and they are less interested in who does what why or when.

An important argument to convince political and senior managers to support a project for proper provision for document storage, retrieval and access is the *Access to Documents Regulation* (European Parliament, et al., 2001). This regulation has relevance for grey literature such as reports drawn up on behalf of the institutions and has a significant impact on the workload and image of the EU institutions.

A clear EU policy on the workflow for *grey literature* including deposit and preservation would ease the daily workload and decrease duplication of procedures and processes.

4.2. Next steps

- (a) Survey webmasters on provision for permanent archiving documents linked to web pages;
- (b) exchange views with the Historical Archives service of each institution, and with the médiathèque;
- (c) increase awareness of staff in publications units and procurement units for studies funded from administrative or non-administrative appropriations, reports, and evaluations;

- (d) alert library and documentation centre staff of the importance of being involved in the workflow for their DG literature;
- (e) ensure that departments using the local print shops for publication are aware of and comply with the rules for archiving copies;
- (f) examine the results of the *Eurolib Working Group on Knowledge Management* to identify points of common application;
- (g) continue to share information with Eurolib on projects, committees and working groups cited in this working paper;
- (h) consult *Library of Congress*, Canadian and British National Libraries, who have already made important advances with this issue.

4.3. Recommendations

Providing long-term access to EU grey literature requires a well organised repository with appropriate consistent metadata to enable search, and a (digital) curation policy. The search tools can be specific to a single repository (less desirable) or federated, using portal and knowledge bases applications. There are examples (Okorama, 2011) of good practice that could be used to draw up a knowledge management strategy.

Based on the information at our disposal, we recommend actions in four areas:

Technical actions

- (a) Create new or adapt existing repositories and registers for deposit of publications and documents currently ‘falling through the cracks’;
- (b) develop tools for (federated) search and library catalogues to harmonise data search.

Legal actions

- (a) Mandatory legal deposit to ensure the PO receives copies of all official publications and that copies are deposited in the main libraries of the institutions;
- (b) standard contracts with clear statements of commercial, literary and artistic copyrights;
- (c) enforce obligatory deposit of studies in the Historical Archives.

Political and managerial actions

- (a) Clearly define statutory workflow for all types of document;

- (b) cooperate between departments and institutions:
 - (i) work and share data with colleagues from the Historical Archives, the PO and all those involved in the production and publication chain;
 - (ii) libraries and archives should use a common form to gather metadata, as both departments need the same information;
 - (iii) work with expert groups, such as the IMMC, CELLAR, EuroVoc to ensure that documents are described with common metadata;
 - (iv) harmonise metadata for search, e.g. libraries should consider harmonising their authority data with the authority data from CELLAR;
 - (v) share best practices;
 - (vi) bring a halt to the creation of new databases without due consideration of the factors listed in this report;
- (c) demonstrate that our goal is in line with the political objectives to increase transparency.

Human resources actions

- (a) The role of librarians in digital curation for preservation is one of the main recommendations in the report *New roles for new times* ⁽¹⁸⁾. Also we would like to emphasise that librarians and archivists are experts in metadata and information organisation and management and should be involved;
- (b) take advantage of existing staff skills in information management and retrieval;
- (c) increase cooperation and understanding between communication experts, IT system managers and developers, and specialists in information science and metadata for research and retrieval.

The following quotation from a recent article by John Quinn, a qualified librarian and Head of Business solutions for the UK Department for Education, adds weight to our proposal for better communication and harmonisation of the workflow between all departments in an institution:

The perennial tug of war between those who know best about communication, collaboration, business change, projects and information management can result in an ultimately fragmented approach ... Bringing the disciplines together in one team forces a positive resolution ... There is a risk that we focus on beautiful information design, or sound technology implementation. If you can't match this sympathetically with your organisation's culture, and get your users to want to use it, it won't work (CILIP, 2011).

⁽¹⁸⁾ Op. cit. p. 6.

It is clear that none of the above can be achieved completely without political will. Ways to demonstrate the value of preservation of and access to EU documents and publications in the political context of communication and transparency must be found.

Much work remains to be done, particularly to attract the attention of politicians and senior management. The group should continue to work, perhaps under the umbrella of knowledge management and access to documents.

Selective bibliography

- Biasiotti, M.A.; Faro, S. (2012). *From Information to Knowledge: online access to legal information: methodologies, trends and perspectives*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- CILIP (2011). Interview: the information workplace. *CILIP Update*. February 2011, pp. 18-20.
- Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC) (2012). *Ranking Web of World repositories*. April 2012 ed. <http://repositories.webometrics.info> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Deckmyn, V. (2002). *Increasing transparency in the European Union?* [conference proceedings]. Maastricht: EIPA.
- Deckmyn, V.; Thomson, I. (1997). *Openness and transparency in the European Union*. Maastricht: EIPA.
- Eurolib (forthcoming). *Citation of EU electronic publications*. Thessaloniki: Cedefop. Eurolib Working Paper.
- European Commission (2010). Co-funded planets project. *Managing Information*, vol. 17, no 3.
- European Commission (2012). *ISA: the Interoperability Solutions for European Public Administrations programme* [online]. Last updated 4 May 2012. <http://ec.europa.eu/isa/> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- European Commission (2012). *Online survey on scientific information in the digital age*. Luxembourg: Publications Office. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2777/36123> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- European Information Association (2011). *EU databases*. <http://eia.org.uk/> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- European Parliament; Council of the European Union (2001). Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 145, 31.5.2001, pp. 43-48. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32001R1049:En:HTML> [accessed 18.5.2011].
- European Union (n.d.). *Official documents from EU institutions, agencies and other bodies*. http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs/index_en.htm [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Farace, D.J.; Schöpfel, J. (2010). *Grey literature in library and information studies*. Berlin: De Gruyter Saur.
- Feather, J.; Matthews, G.; Eden, P. (1996). *Preservation management: policies and practices in British libraries*. Aldershot (UK): Gower, 1996.

- Giordano, T. (2007). Electronic resources management and long term preservation (Is the library a growing organism?). Paper presented at the conference on *Strategies for cultural heritage on line, Firenze, 14-16 December 2006*. Fondazione Rinascimento Digitale. <http://eprints.rclis.org/bitstream/10760/9099/1/E-Lis-GIORDANO-2007-final.pdf> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Giordano, T. (2011). Dalla memoria cartacea alla memoria digitale: Verso nuovi modelli di riferimento. Unpublished paper presented at the conference *L'Italia delle biblioteche. Scommettendo sul futuro nel 150° anniversario dell'unità nazionale. Milano, 3-4 March 2011*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10760/15636> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Greynet (2011). *Grey literature network service*. Amsterdam: GreyNet International. <http://www.greynet.org/greynethome/aboutgreynet.html> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Grönewald, R.; Breytenbach, A. (2011). The use of metadata and preservation methods for continuous access to digital data. *The electronic library*, Vol. 29 No 2, pp. 236-248. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02640471111125195> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Jahn, N.; Lösch, M; Horstmann, W. (2010). Automatic Aggregation of Faculty Publications from Personal Web Pages. *Code 4 Lib journal*, No 11. <http://journal.code4lib.org/articles/3765> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Jones, Linda (2009). Shining a light on Commission grey literature: Collaboration between Europa and the Central Library could ease the burdens of Europa web publishers and enhance visibility of Commission publications on the web: discussion paper. *Web Editor*, DG INFSO, 7 July 2009.
- Niggeman, E.; De Decker, J.; Levy, M. (2011). *The new renaissance: report of the comité des sages on bringing Europe's cultural heritage online*. Luxembourg: Publications Office. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2759/45571> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Okoroma, F. N. (2011). Towards effective management of grey literature for higher education, research and national development. *Library Review*, Vol. 60 No 9, pp. 789-802. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00242531111176808> [accessed 18.5.2012].
- Peter, D.; Lossau, N. (2011). Driver: building a sustainable infrastructure for global repositories. *Electronic Library*, vol. 29; no 2.
- Quinn, J. (2011). Interview: The information workplace. *CILIP Update*, February 2011, pp. 18-20.
- Transparency International (2011). *Access to EU documents: gaining access to information and EU documents* [online]. http://archive.transparency.org/regional_pages/europe_central_asia/eu_liaison_office/access_to_eu_documents [accessed 18.5.2012].

Walters, T.; Skinner, K. (2011). *New roles for new times: digital curation for preservation*. Washington: Association of Research Libraries. http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/nrnt_digital_curation17mar11.pdf [accessed 18.5.2012].

Wikipedia (2012). *Grey literature* [online]. Last updated 17 April 2012. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grey_literature [accessed 18.5.2012].

Abbreviations

AEI	Archive of European Integration
ARES	web application which manages Commission documents under the e-Domec rules (registration, filing, preservation, appraisal and transfer of files to the Commission's historical archives, legal value of electronic and digitised documents)
CELLAR	Common access to EU information, to make available at a single place all metadata and digital content managed by the Publications Office in a harmonised and standardised way
CoR	Committee of the Regions
EDC	European documentation centre
E-DOMECE	Electronic archiving and document management in the European Commission
ESO	European Sources Online
EUR-Lex	EUR-Lex provides free access to European Union law and other documents considered to be public
Eurovoc	multilingual thesaurus of the European Union
HAEU	Historical Archives of the European Union
ID	identification number
MEP	Member of Parliament
PO	Publications Office of the European Union
Pubsty	JRC publications repository

Annexes

(copies of selected internal documents)



Annex A

Survey questionnaire and responses



Respondents: 24 displayed, 24 total Status: Open

Launched date: 1/19/2011 Closed date: N/A





2.1. Is there a mandatory deposit for your institution?

		Response		Points	Avg
		Total	%		
Yes		9	38	n/a	n/a
No		15	62	n/a	n/a
Total respondents			24		



3.2. Is there a digital repository?

		Response		Points	Avg
		Total	%		
Yes		15	62	n/a	n/a
No		9	38	n/a	n/a
Total respondents			24		





4.2.1. If yes, which one/ones?

		Response		Points	Avg
		Total	%		
Publications Office		8	33	n/a	n/a
Home/institutional repository		9	38	n/a	n/a
EU Historical Archive		4	17	n/a	n/a
Other, please specify view		24	100	n/a	n/a
Total respondents			24		




5.3. Is there a physical repository?

		Response		Points	Avg
		Total	%		
Yes		19	79	n/a	n/a
No		5	21	n/a	n/a
Total respondents			24		

6.3.1. If yes, which one/s?

		Response		Points	Avg
		Total	%		
Publications Office		4	17	n/a	n/a
Home/institutional repository		7	29	n/a	n/a
EU Historical Archive		4	17	n/a	n/a
Other, please specify view		24	100	n/a	n/a
Total respondents		24			

7.4. Is there a document workflow to ensure long term preservation and access?

		Response		Points	Avg
		Total	%		
Yes		14	58	n/a	n/a
No		10	42	n/a	n/a
If yes, please describe it. view		16	67	n/a	n/a
Total respondents		24	100		

8. Have you detected any gaps in existing procedures?

View responses to this question view	
Total respondents	12
(skipped this question)	12

9.5. Would you like to share your best practices, or indicate what you consider would be the perfect workflow for your institution?

View responses to this question view	
Total respondents	11
(skipped this question)	13

10. Indicate your name and contact details if you are willing to answer more detailed questions.

View responses to this question view	
Total respondents	20
(skipped this question)	4

Annex B

DG Enterprise manual of budgetary and financial procedures

In: Manual of Budgetary and Financial Procedures of DG ENTR

6.2.3.2.14 Certificate Requesting the Registration of the Study in the Historical Archives and in ENTR's Library

A formal document asking to deposit a study delivered under a service contract in the Commission's central historical archives. It is enough to insert the filled in and signed copy of the certificate (request) into the payment file.

However, do not forget that the original and two copies of the filled in certificate, signed by the Head of Unit or Director, accompanied by a copy of the study bearing the "read and approved" mention and a copy of the contract have to be sent to:

**Document Management Agent – Clerk –
Administration and Archives Office for Infrastructures and Logistics in Brussels**

The original of the certificate will be sent back to you from the historical archives services confirming the archiving of your study.

The above obligation stems from an internal audit and subsequent instructions of the Secretariat-General of 22/04/2003 (D/310100).

No corporate tool is available which would enable to search for existing studies to exploit their results and avoid overlapping when commissioning new studies. Such a tool should be, according to the information from the historical archives, available by 2012. In the meantime, the operational units need to consult relevant departments when searching for information regarding the available studies within their field of activities.

Moreover, the ENTR's library is setting up a repository for the studies commissioned by the DG. Therefore, a paper and/or electronic copy of the study needs to be sent to ENTR's library, where it will be registered in the Commission's library catalogue ECLAS and archived. A copy of a note/ email registered in ARES proving the submission of the study to ENTR's library needs to be included in the payment file.

Annex C

Form to accompany studies deposited in Historical Archive

ETUDES DE LA COMMISSION: FICHE D'INFORMATION

**CE ARCHIVES HISTORIQUES
DE LA COMMISSION – OIB.7-AH
Bureau Enregistrement des Etudes**

**Certificat de dépôt et attestation de service
fait d'une étude ou enquête
effectuée pour le compte de la
Commission**

Direction Générale

Direction

Unité

Titre de l'étude:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Contractant:

.....

Fonctionnaire chargé du dossier sur
le plan technique:

Nom :

Bureau :

Tél. :

.....
(signature du fonctionnaire chargé du dossier)

Pour conformité de la transmission
et de la validité des données contenues
dans les pages suivantes ainsi que
pour attestation de service fait

.....
(signature et cachet de l'Assistant ou d'un autre
fonctionnaire habilité)

Date:

**(A remplir par le Bureau
d'Enregistrement des Etudes)**

N°

Pour dépôt conforme

.....
(signature et cachet)

Bruxelles, le

<p><i>A étblir sous le contrôle exclusif du fonctionnaire chargé de l'étude sous l'aspect technique</i></p>
--

A. Référence de l'étude ou de l'enquête:

N°

Page

Cote

Services associés

B. Intitulé de l'étude ou de l'enquête:

B – 1 Intitulé repris au PV de la Commission

Notes explicatives pour remplir correctement les rubriques A et B ci-dessus:

A – Il y a lieu de reprendre avec **exactitude** les données suivantes:

N° du PV de la Commission

Page de ce PV

Cote de l'étude

Exemple: pour l'étude 'Contribution de la politique R & D au développement régional', indiquer comme suit:

COM(80)PV 558

Page 8

XII/Z/80/236 (p. 672 c)

B – 1 L'intitulé doit correspondre **exactement** à celui qui est repris au PV de la Commission.

<p><i>A étblir sous le contrôle exclusif du fonctionnaire chargé de l'étude sous l'aspect technique</i></p>
--

- B – 2 Traduction en français de cet intitulé (La traduction française est actuellement requise pour la documentation automatisée)
- B – 3 Désignation du rapport partiel (annexé) faisant partie de l'étude ou de l'enquête sous B – 1
- B – 4 Traduction en français de la désignation reprise sous B – 3 (La traduction française est actuellement requise pour la documentation automatisée)
- B – 5 N° (s) d'enregistrement du/ou des certificat(s) de dépôt déjà délivré(s) ayant trait à la même étude ou enquête.

Notes explicatives pour remplir correctement la rubrique B ci-dessus:

- B – 3 La rubrique B – 3 couvre les cas où l'étude approuvée par la Commission serait fractionnée en différentes sous-études.
Dans ce cas, la désignation sous B – 3 doit correspondre exactement au titre de la sous-étude annexée au présent certificat.
- B – 5 Dans le cas d'études fractionnées, cette indication permet de rassembler les différents éléments administratifs relatifs à l'étude globale.

<p><i>A établir sous le contrôle exclusif du fonctionnaire chargé de l'étude sous l'aspect technique</i></p>
--

C – Désignation du contractant:

D – Coût de l'étude en monnaie contractuelle

- Poste budgétaire
- N° d'engagement
- Montant engagé

E – Description sommaire du contenu de l'étude ou de l'enquête et des principales conclusions et/ou recommandations auxquelles elle aboutit:

Notes explicatives pour remplir correctement la rubrique C et D ci-dessus:

- C – Il y a lieu d'indiquer **obligatoirement** le co-contractant de la Commission repris à la première page du contrat d'étude ou d'enquête et d'ajouter, dans toute la mesure du possible, son adresse.
- D – Il y a lieu de se référer uniquement à l'unité monétaire reprise dans le contrat.
- E – Cette rubrique doit être correctement remplie sans se contenter d'un pur et simple renvoi à des pages de l'étude ou de l'enquête. Si l'espace n'est pas suffisant, prière d'ajouter une feuille supplémentaire.

*A établir sous le contrôle exclusif du fonctionnaire chargé de l'étude
sous l'aspect technique*

F – Appréciation de l'étude ou de l'enquête selon les critères suivantes:

qualité de fond du rapport	bonne satisfaisante insuffisante
qualité de la rédaction du rapport	bonne satisfaisante insuffisante
validité du contenu	long terme court terme déjà périmée
nombre de services que l'étude ou l'enquête peut intéresser	important moyen limité
indiquer lesquels (en dehors des services associés)	

G – L'étude ou enquête peut-elle être diffusée à l'extérieur de la Commission?

oui – non

H – Mise en œuvre des conclusions et/ou recommandations de l'étude ou de l'enquête:

- préparation d'un acte communautaire ☐
- source de statistiques communautaires ☐
- document de travail pour une conférence ou un comité ☐
- document de travail pour un groupe d'experts ☐
- préparation de nouveaux programmes ☐
- contrôle de l'application des actes communautaires ☐
- document de référence pour des services de la Commissions ☐

Notes explicatives pour remplir correctement les rubriques F – G et H ci-dessus:

- F – Pour chaque ligne comportant trois mentions, rayer les deux mentions inutiles.
- G – Rayer la mention inutile.
- H – Mettre une croix dans la ou les cases concernées.

DEPOT D'ETUDES AUPRES DU SERVICE ARCHIVES HISTORIQUES (OIB.7-AH)

***Opérations à effectuer sous le contrôle exclusif de l'unité administrative
qui suit le dossier sur le plan technique***

1. Tout certificat de dépôt d'études doit être établi en trois exemplaires dont l'original et deux **copies lisibles**.
 2. Tout certificat doit **obligatoirement** être accompagné des deux pièces suivantes, chaque pièce en un seul exemplaire:
 - une **copie lisible** du contrat original avec signatures;
 - l'étude ou l'enquête elle-même, **sur laquelle est apposée, à côté du titre, la mention 'attestation de service fait' suivie du nom et de la signature de l'Assistant ou d'un autre fonctionnaire habilité de la DG.**
- L'intitulé de l'étude ou de l'enquête doit être **rigoureusement le même** dans le **certificat de dépôt et les deux autres pièces** qui l'accompagnent.
3. Les fonctionnaires chargés de suivre les dossiers relatifs aux études ou aux enquêtes feront transiter le présent certificat et l'étude par le service financier concerné au sein de leur DG, qui assure la coordination nécessaire et l'envoi au Bureau 'Enregistrement des études' auprès du Service Archives Historiques (OIB.7-AH).

Annex D

Extract from CoR studies contract

ARTICLE II.8 - OWNERSHIP OF THE RESULTS - INTELLECTUAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Any results or rights thereon, including copyright and other intellectual or industrial property rights, obtained in performance of the Contract, shall be owned solely by the Committee, which may use, publish, assign or transfer them as it sees fit, without geographical or other limitation, except where industrial or intellectual property rights exist prior to the Contract being entered into.

ARTICLE II.9 - CONFIDENTIALITY

II.9.1. The Contractor undertakes to treat in the strictest confidence and not make use of or divulge to third parties any information or documents which are linked to performance of the Contract. The Contractor shall continue to be bound by this undertaking after completion of the tasks.

II.9.2. The Contractor shall obtain from each member of his staff, board and directors an undertaking that they will respect the confidentiality of any information which is linked, directly or

12

indirectly, to execution of the tasks and that they will not divulge to third parties or use for their own benefit or that of any third party any document or information not available publicly, even after completion of the tasks.

ARTICLE II.10 - USE, DISTRIBUTION AND PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION

II.10.1 The Contractor shall authorise the Committee to process, use, distribute and publish, for whatever purpose, by whatever means and on whatever medium, any data contained in or relating to the Contract, in particular the identity of the Contractor, the subject matter, the duration, the amount paid and the reports. Where personal data is concerned, Article I.9 shall apply.

II.10.2 Unless otherwise provided by the Special Conditions, the Committee shall not be required to distribute or publish documents or information supplied in performance of the Contract. If it decides not to publish the documents or information supplied, the Contractor may not have them distributed or published elsewhere without prior written authorisation from the Committee.

II.10.3 Any distribution or publication of information relating to the Contract by the Contractor shall require prior written authorisation from the Committee and shall mention the amount paid by the Committee. It shall state that the opinions expressed are those of the Contractor only and do not represent the Committee's official position.

II.10.4 The use of information obtained by the Contractor in the course of the Contract for purposes other than its performance shall be forbidden, unless the Committee has specifically given

3.2.3 Reports

Reports are long documents, as a rule comprising some 50-100 pages. Certain reports are based on the results of a questionnaire (survey) drawn up and sent by the tenderer with the agreement of the CoR. In cases where a comparative analysis of several Member States is needed, it should cover at least one half of the Member States and take into account their diversity, in terms of both their size and their geographical location.

When drafting such reports, the tenderer will take care to act in cooperation with the CoR's services. To this end, the tenderer must make provision for a follow-up meeting in the detailed statement of costs included in the tender.

Moreover, it should be noted that the reports will always include a summary, an introduction and a conclusion and that, in the majority of cases, a presentation will be held at the commission meeting. In the context of this invitation, travel expenses and daily allowances of the expert will be refunded on the basis of the regulation applicable to the CoR's experts/speakers, and therefore shall not be included in the tender calculation.

The deadline set for the preparation of a report varies according to the urgency of the issue (if necessary, the inter-institutional timetable shall be taken into account) and its complexity, but should not, in general, exceed four months.

The issue of subsidiarity and proportionality, more specifically as defined in the Protocol on the Application of the Principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality of the Treaty on European Union (Treaty of Amsterdam), and amended in the Lisbon Treaty, must also be discussed in these reports.

Outlook and impact reports

Outlook and impact reports are based on the regulatory perspective and/or administrative, economic, social, environmental or financial cost of a Commission legislative proposal or major political text. They aim to establish the territorial impact and may include quantitative or qualitative assessments.

a) *Outlook opinions* are prepared on issues with a strong regional impact in advance of Commission proposals for legislation and even before the Commission starts consultations on a given regulation. The White Paper on European Governance states that: The Committee of the Regions should play a more proactive role in examining policy, for example through the preparation of exploratory reports in advance of Commission proposals ¹². The Cooperation Protocol between the CoR and the European Commission calls for a more proactive role for the Committee upstream of Community action, through *outlook opinions* on future Community policies.

b) *Impact reports* aim to assess the downstream impact of the implementation of certain directives on the local and regional level. The White Paper on Governance provides for an examination by the Committee of the local and regional impact of certain directives in the fields of transport, energy and the environment³.

3.2.4 Organising workshops

7. TIME-FRAME – SUBMITTING APPRAISAL DOCUMENTS – FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS

7.1 Calendar

The time-frame for delivery of services will be set out in each specific contract or order form, with a specific delivery date.

7.2 Submitting appraisal documents

Services performed by the contractors under *orders or specific contracts* shall be set out in documents that the contractor will send to the Committee on paper and in triplicate. The tenderer must also forward these documents via diskette and/or CD-ROM, in a format which can be used by the Committee (Word, Excel or similar programmes). A copy should also be sent by electronic mail.

29

7.3 Interim reports

If an order or specific contract requires an interim report, the latter shall set out the work carried out and the results obtained as at the date established for the delivery of the interim report. It will reveal in particular the possible consequences of the results obtained on all the work being carried out under the order or specific contract and on the work programme covering the period up to the day of the delivery of the final report.

The interim reports will be sent to the Committee on the date specified in the order or the specific contract.

7.4 Final document

The final document will set out all the work carried out and will include the results obtained in performance of the order or the specific contract. Moreover, it will contain a summary of the main results obtained. The final document on each provision of expertise must be signed by the expert or experts responsible for carrying out the services set out in this invitation to tender.

The draft of this document will be submitted to the Committee no later than the day mentioned in the order. Then, the Committee will inform the contractor of its acceptance or comments, within the time specified in Article I.5.2 of the framework contract. The contractor will submit the final document to the Committee within the time specified in Article I.5.2 of the framework contract.

Annex E

Preliminary data collected prior to the creation of the working group

15/04/2011 - 1/13

Grey Literature – access and retrieval – State of play Some examples of current practice

This inventory does not cover "officially available/archived documents " in PODL/HERMES (associated) databases

INFSO:

Studies are (sometimes/often) loaded onto INFSO web pages by local publishers. This means the documents are stored in local document folders on the web server (dispersed by sub site) the web pages link to those document files, stored in the folders (dispersed by sub site) Studies are NOT systematically added to INFSO database-driven web document management system (so not findable in a local web "library" search) Studies are NOT systematically added to the INFSO library (or ECLAS catalogue) .

This is certainly not "best practice". Preferred options would be:

a permanent document file (could be local - e.g., on INFSO server for DG INFSO documents, studies, etc. or Commission-wide - established by COMM, SG?). Websites link to documents in this permanent file, and cease to link to when they are no longer topical - without affecting retrieval of the documents when the website is revised or archived.

Documents to remain "findable" indefinitely for serious researchers, through search mechanism. This could be done using:

DG INFSO internal "web library" system (Disadvantage: local solution only. Some additional development would probably also be necessary) searchable via Commission Central library - ECLAS catalogue. a new custom-developed central repository for the whole Commission with its own search facility (but why should it be separate from the Central Library search facility?)

Clearly, a Commission-wide solution makes more sense - but experience of waiting for Commission-wide solutions leads us to conclude that an INFSO-only solution will have to be adopted, especially as the situation is becoming urgent.

The matter of studies not being accessible/traceable has become an issue of concern at higher levels so there will be some pressure to find a solution. INFSO are also doing an audit of all sites and discovering in detail the extent to which web pages are functioning as libraries. There is now a growing consensus that these documents should be in a (searchable) library/archive with possible internet access.

At a meeting of the internet editors forum in April, the matter of a document repository (and web archiving generally) was raised by a number of colleagues from different DGs, including INFSO. There was general agreement that something must be done.

Wake up call. Questions have been raised by MS about the use of EC funds for studies. To justify expenditure the Commission must be able to provide copies of reports thus funded.

JRC: <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository>

"On 1 March, the JRC launched the Internet version of its Publications Repository. Bibliographic data of almost 10000 articles and papers representing a wealth of

15/04/2011 - 2/13

knowledge are now available to the public. In addition, more than 1700 technical reports (EUR series) are freely available for download. Publications can be found by free-text search, or advanced search based on bibliographic data. The publications can be browsed by JRC Institute, publication year, author, or title and cross-links are supplied to find all works of a particular author.

The JRC Publications Repository is based on the open source software DSPACE, which has been developed at MIT and is already used by more than 500 organisations for building open repositories."

PUBSY stores most of the scientific publications produced by JRC researchers but is not intended as the repository of documents produced by JRC. Technically speaking, Pubsy has implemented DSpace (open source software) as tool for the management of the repository. The public repository for JRC scientific articles and for a subset of JRC reports (the ones that are public) now includes 12000 records = 50% of JRC production. JRC have gone through a long process of resolving the IPR issues and the result is a good compromise. JRC could give a presentation on the project including the process related issues, future developments and some interesting side effects such as IPR and DOI.

The EUI in Florence is using DSPACE for the same purpose.

ENTR:

Studies/Reports are available on the website and there is no permanent URL to guarantee the long-term availability of copies which have not been printed and kept in the library.

In summer 2009 the ENTR tackled the mammoth task of archiving studies. 150 boxes (containing some 1500 documents) of studies commissioned by both DG03 and DG ENTR. Part of the collection is catalogued in ECLAS :

[http://ec.europa.eu/eclas/F/?func=find-c&local_base=eclas&ccl_term=\(\(wco=enterprise\)%20AND%20\(wdo%20=etude\)\)](http://ec.europa.eu/eclas/F/?func=find-c&local_base=eclas&ccl_term=((wco=enterprise)%20AND%20(wdo%20=etude)))

A working group has been set up to define the workflow to register and archive studies financed via the DG procurement process.

Pros & Cons of ECLAS:

not a record management system, but ensures that information about studies carried out for the Commission is searchable and accessible

information freely available via the ECLAS OPAC (Open public access)

full text access on-line - *as long as the Commission adopts a policy to ensure stability of URLs;*

retrieval using subjects terms and their semantic equivalents (see, see also) e.g.: *Cessation of trading* = Business closures, Closure of factories, Plant shutdowns). Most classic search engines do not provide this facility; i.e. powerful metadata search of subject fields (MARC21 fields 650, 655, 653);

retrieval of studies on a specific subject commissioned by a single DG, whatever form the name of the DG takes (DG III, DG Enterprise...) studies on similar subjects commissioned by several DGs can be retrieved;

identification of studies carried out by a specified contractor ;

added-value information for studies carried out or financed by the Commission, from stakeholders (universities, professional associations, consultants...).

It is important to register and archive studies financed by DG ENTR centrally because

it is a legal obligation under the provisions on sound financial management;
the DG may be obliged to retrieve a study as a result of a request for access to documents under Reg. 1049/2001;

it is the only way to avoid "duplication" and make such studies known to internal and external audiences.

In the past the library team received certificates "de dépôt" from some Units and Directorates in the DG sporadically. It has established an (incomplete) register and collection of ENTR studies based on the documents in its possession.

Current library team has agreed to act as the central contact point from now on, to register "metadata" for all studies it receives in the Commission library catalogue ECLAS to archive printed copies - provided that the issue of space requirements can be solved. Commission Central Library and other Commission libraries have agreed to work together on identifying common standards for registering metadata for studies financed by Commission departments in ECLAS.

DG ENTR proposal:

- all relevant actors to agree on the procedure to be followed.
- a note to be drawn up for the Director's signature addressed to all Directors setting out the legal and contractual context, indicating the Intranet page (yet to be created) where all information on the new procedure is to be found.
- Library team takes responsibility for continuing to register and archive studies received.
- registering the backlog of studies already in the library but not yet recorded in ECLAS will require additional human resources.

AGRI:

Proposed work flow

Studies are printed in 2 copies. 1 for AGRI library 1 for Central Library

Studies (mainly?) are scanned into ARES

Studies are recorded in ECLAS with a link to any on-line versions (links may break if there is no web archiving policy) .The official information about the study contract and the ARES number, where one exists, are recorded in the ECLAS record.

EMPL:

All DG EMPL studies are kept in electronic format in a repository and management system called SMART. SMART is accessible only to EMPL staff? Also used by INFSO? A paper copy is kept in the Library after the transfer to OIB archives. Studies since 2003 are catalogued in ECLAS.

The Library does not receive and catalogue systematically the documents available only on the web or published outside the Official publications programme.

Studies and other grey literature documents (some date back 10 years or more) are made available via the documents database

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?langId=en>

where these are still interesting and relevant for users. But this is certainly not intended to be a comprehensive repository of all documents produced by the DG. I'm not aware of any long-term archiving policy.

Archives of older versions of the Europa website are made accessible by the webmaster but there is no guarantee as to the length of time archived documents will be kept. This archive is only available internally (not from Europa).

DEV:

I-centre – No policy on content and archiving. No intended to be a permanent document repository.

15/04/2011 - 4/13

Print shop – Brussels:

The print shop in Brussels offers publishing services to DGs, including the assistance of a graphic designer, expedition of publications in bulk, or to individuals internally or externally.

Publications do not have an official ID and there appears to be no archiving policy.

Although the vocation of the print shop is, as quoted below, to provide services for internal documents only, this is not the case in practice.

The digitisation services were not conceived to provide a repository for long term storage and retrieval.

"The vocation of the sector, Concept & Reproduction, part of OIB and formerly known as the «printing workshops» is to provide a service for the design, reproduction and distribution of all the documents necessary for your internal communication needs. By internal documents we mean those which *are not* official publications of the European Union aimed at the general public. Publication services for this type of document can be provided by the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. For these documents, please contact Mr. J.P.Goossens (42365). "

All documents for which the target population is colleagues in the DG, the Commission or of any of the European Institutions are offered a professional service covering 5 general areas:

Printing of documents

Graphic Design

Digitisation and electronic archiving

Distribution

Business card service

A restricted number of COM/SEC documents are produced in hard copy in the print shop. The print shop issues annual CDs with the texts of all COM/SEC finals published in each calendar year. The microfiche/filming of such documents continues – this is still the only durable long-term storage media.

OP:

The Publications Office of the European Union is the publishing house of the institutions, agencies and other bodies of the European Union. It provides direct and free-of-charge access to European law and all publications of the European Union. As a publisher, the Office has the duty to offer the highest quality service to its customers — the originating departments of the institutions and other bodies of the European Union — and to its public, the citizens of the EU and people throughout the world interested in European affairs. The Office's major objectives are to become a centre of legal and general European information, to promote its role of editorial coordinator, to promote multilingualism and to be at the forefront of the new technologies in the field of publishing and communication.

The Office of Publications issues identifiers – ISBN ISSN Catalogue numbers DOI. All publications received after the issue of an identifier are stored in their Digital Library and can be supplied on-demand to anyone who requires a copy (free or for payment). Some documents for which IDs are issued are not sent to the OP. The site PubliCare provides links to forms to make requests for publishing and for publication IDs. Each DG and each EU Institution has an author liaison officer.

Copyright

When a document is commissioned from a contractor, DG EAC shall conclude with the latter a standard service/study contract, which stipulates that any results or rights obtained in performance of the contract shall be owned exclusively by the European Communities (or the applicable legal person), except where copyright or any other right of ownership already exists. By way of contract, DG EAC shall thus be authorised to publish/co-publish the text as an official publication, without limitation, throughout the world, for the full legal term of copyright, in whole or in part, in all editions, forms and media

The Service Level Agreement between OIB and OPOCE has an impact on the production of Grey literature.

The Publications Office and OIB — who does what?

"At the end of March, the Publications Office of the European Union and the Office for Infrastructure and Logistics in Brussels signed a service level agreement (SLA). One goal of the SLA was to clarify the respective tasks of both parties and, thus, to cooperate better in order to satisfy their clients' and end-users' needs.

The task of the Publications Office is to publish publications of the European institutions, while OIB is in charge of reproduction services of the European Commission in Brussels. Therefore, the Publications Office shall treat any document, regardless of its medium or format, requiring international identifiers (ISBN, ISSN, DOI, EUR number). OIB is responsible for other documents necessary for the internal or external communication needs of the European Commission (administrative documents, greeting cards, internal newsletters, etc.).

The Publications Office and OIB will inform you of the nature and conditions of their services and, if needed, redirect you to the proper Office.

We are also working on an agreement that would allow OIB to assist the Publications Office in the case of an urgent request from a European Commission DG (the service will not be free of charge)." (published on PubliCare on 22 April 2010)

At the beginning of 2009 an online tool, Impressive, was made available to handle printing requests to OIB Print Shop. The system is accessible to everyone in the Commission via the ECAS login.

"IMPRESSIVE" : une nouvelle interface pour vos demandes d'impression de documents.

<http://application.servers.cc.cec.eu.int/impressive/newDemande.do>

le lien officiel entre le service demandeur et nos ateliers.

Vous consignerez sur des pages intuitives les caractéristiques de vos documents à imprimer et y joindrez directement vos fichiers. Impressive se chargera d'authentifier votre demande via le filtre ECAS. Le suivi de votre demande sera automatisé et vous saurez à tout moment l'état d'avancement de vos publications

All print requests can be traced in the system and it is possible to carry out searches. A number is attributed to every print request along with an identifier for the requesting DG. The tool was only conceived as a system to improve the workflows involved in handling and carrying out orders for printing, but perhaps the application can provide the means to trace, retrieve and provide metadata (cataloguing, indexing and access rights information) for documents that are not "archived" elsewhere.

No reply has been received to a request sent to OIB to obtain more information on the facilities available in "Impressive".

Many of the publications are substantial and their audience may be purely internal or also external – conference brochures and documents.

An example is the Central Library's own 50th anniversary publication:

Some publications might be considered as "ephemera" for example postcards and posters. On the other hand the OP also publishes documents of this nature that receive a publications office catalogue number. An example is the series of postcards issued in 2004 to celebrate enlargement: NA-47-02-850-LV-D, etc.

When requesting a publication from the OP the publications budget of the DG is debited whereas the print shop has a budget to cover the costs of publications which they print.

Use of "Impressive" will probably lead to an increase of the number of documents considered as "grey literature", as the flexibility and economic advantage offered by OIB compared to OP encourages the choice of OIB Print shop rather than OP as the publication tool for, for example, publications prepared for conferences or other semi public audiences. In this case the publication is not stored in the PODL, nor in any other repository, and has no official identifier. Previously it was possible to request official IDs from OP and then use them on publications created via OIB Print Shop. Now this occurs only in exceptional cases.

The "originating" service is responsible for archiving the document (in ARES)

COMM

The issue of a document repository was brought up an internet editors'meeting. Although everyone realises it is important, nobody volunteered to dig into it. SG realises it may have a responsibility and the matter will be discussed internally in SG. Internet editors will discuss it again on October 26th.

It isn't really a technical problem but rather, lack of leadership. EuroLIB, not being exclusively Commission, might generate some pressure - since no internal service seems very bothered. I wonder is there any other major international institution that cares so little for its own intellectual and documentary output.

"It's been years since I have pleaded in favour of the use of genuine repositories for all the grey literature documents that are presented on Europa. Some DGs have done it for their own site but each time they have used a specific 'home written' application for it. (see f.e. the Document section on the Trade site - http://ec.europa.eu/trade/documents-and-publications/index_en.htm or on the Dev site - <http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/engine/>) . No general approach was followed. When we choose WebPublisher/Documentum as the Corporate Web Content Management System (CWCMS), I thought we could kill two birds with one stone having the Web Publishing facilities of Documentum on the one hand for publishing the 'normal' web pages and its document repository facilities for storing all background documents in a structured way. Unfortunately practice is always much more complicated than theory and at this moment we have just barely convinced about half of the webmasters to use the CWCMS for managing their webpages. We are also gradually implementing interfaces to external official document repositories - Rapid being the first - , but nothing has been started yet about managing or structuring the grey literature documents. It has much to do also with missing leadership: DG COMM doesn't feel too much concerned about managing dull documents (we're there for communicating aren't we? ;-)) and SG doesn't seem to bother too much about grey literature, so nobody wants to take the lead in coordination. Maybe this EUROLIB group could make things move? "

DOCUMENTUM:

About Documentum: the situation is a bit confused. It is used as the document repository in the context of Ares, so it should contain the grey literature some way or another, but of course, it is mixed there with many other things and I'm not sure if it would really be usable in its current form. The question is not really technical, any document

management system could do the job. But preferably, we should try to all use the same system, so that it becomes easier for a web publishing system to interface with it.

SANCO:

Any unit can "publish". But Unit A 1 advises on the correct way to do this (technical and contractual aspects). For example, a colleague would like to publish a brochure on food safety he contacts UNIT A1 to find out how to do it. He can use a framework contract to design a brochure and arrange for production and distribution of the publication with OP. BEPA

BEPA publishes current awareness information on its internal website. This includes valuable articles on various aspects of their work. The articles do not contain sensitive information and are of general interest not only to other colleagues in the Commission, but also to external researchers.

BEPA currently have no plans to make this information accessible. There appears to be no archiving policy to ensure long term access.

COMP:

Un groupe de travail réfléchit actuellement à ces questions et notamment en raison des demandes d'accès au document. L'idée étant de mettre en place une procédure qui prévoit:

- La traçabilité d'une étude (ex. liste avec responsable/source...),
- Son statut (diffusion interne, publique, confidentielle...),
- Son enregistrement et sa localisation (ex. Aleph, base de données interne...)
- Son stockage (ex. serveur, bibliothèque, archives internes...)

La situation actuelle:

Publication publiée (web, print): cataloguée en coopération avec le service publication et stockée par la bibliothèque;

Littérature grise/études: transmises au Greffe qui assure l'enregistrement (base de données interne) et l'archivage.

DGT:

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/publications/index_en.htm

DGT équipe Etudes a déjà donné son accord pour que les publications DGT soient cataloguées et stockées à la Bibliothèque centrale.

Outstanding questions to be answered by DGT. 02

Is there a work flow that guarantees long-term access to web and other non-OP publications? Some examples of publications of long-term interest to the public and Commission colleagues:

Lingua Franca

Does a Lingua Franca exist today, and has one ever existed? The study addresses this question both in a historical perspective and in the context of today's world. It aims to analyse the role of a vehicular language in our globalised society as well as its possible interactions with alternative strategies aimed to protect and promote language diversity. The study is carried out internally during 2010.

Contact person: Flavia Frangini

Contribution

of translation to a multilingual society in Europe

The study addresses the economic, cultural, legal and political implications of translation in society as well as its perception in the European Union. The study is outsourced and will be ready in the second half 2010. It will also propose indicators to monitor this contribution.

Contact person: Silva Kauko

Editing for efficiency

Can the usefulness of editing for the translation process be measured? Internal study to be carried out in 2010.

Contact person: Silva Kauko

Multilingual lawmaking

The study aims to analyse the role of multilingualism in the EU's core processes (law making), based on case studies. It analyses how the 23 official languages interact in, and impact on, the EU's lawmaking process.

Contact person: Catherine Vieilledent-Monfort

Multilingual business practices

What can European business teach us on multilingual communication strategies? Case studies with assorted recommendations. Follow-up for the study on the size of the language industry. To be outsourced in 2010

Contact person: Inkaliisa Vihonen

The size of the language industry in the EU

The study gives systematic and comprehensive information on the size of the language industry in the European Union. The study was outsourced and was presented end of 2009.

Contact person: Inkaliisa Vihonen

La traduction à la Commission européenne: 1958-2010

The aim of this study is to analyse the evolution of the translation services in the Commission from 4 to 23 languages: development of translation tools, changes in the workflow, and the importance of the service in the Institution and the birth of multilingualism policy at EU level. The study was conducted internally and was presented in a Conference in March 2010.

Contact person: Catherine Vieilledent-Monfort

Web translation as a genre

Is web translation a genre of its own? What is the role of web translation in the Commission's communication policy? The study was conducted internally, with the contribution of Unit DGT.D.2 (Web Translation) and was presented in a Translation Forum in February 2010.

Contact person: Silva Kauko

Language technology tools in EU translation

The study, finalised in November 2008, consists of an inventory and analysis of the translation- and authoring-related language technology tools available on the current market. The study was outsourced, and the contractor presented the results at DGT on 5 November 2008.

Contact person: Inkaliisa Vihonen

Inventory of research on multilingualism and translation

An inventory of research projects in European universities was carried out in all EU Member States in 2008 and 2009.

Contact person: Marlies Van Hoof

ENV/CLIMA:

ENV have an "electronic bookshelf" where they store copies of their publications, including documents with official IDs from OP. The document cataloguing and indexing metadata is added to ECLAS.

(comment: If the document is only conceived as electronic the OP may not always receive the PDF for their repository. The link on the electronic shelf is not a permalink. This is a web space not an official repository. The risks are that with staff, administrative, and web policy changes this space could disappear).

The electronic shelf was started before EU bookshop had a stable link. Often the DOI can take weeks to activate and in the meantime the DG wishes to make the document available online.

Example of a link as used for DGs ENV and CLIMA:

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/pdfs/2009/pub-2009-011-bg.pdf>

que possible des publications électroniques de la DG.

Questions pratiques:

Il peut s'arriver que des documents que vous décidez d'ajouter dans votre "library" aient déjà été catalogués par quelqu'un d'autre. Et si c'est le cas, cette personne aura ajouté (en principe) le lien Bookshop. Ceci est plus que suffisant pour accéder le doc. Allez vous vous amuser à modifier ces notices?

Ou au contraire, vous créez la notice, mais le catalogueur qui corrige la notice repère un lien bookshop. Qu'est qu'elle fait. Il/elle doit le remplacer?

Rien ne vous empêche de créer une digital library avec des documents qui se trouvent ailleurs. Mais pourquoi héberger deux fois les mêmes documents dans deux serveurs différents? Normalement on ne crée pas de collections digitales sur le seul critère de la localisation. Il y a d'autres critères comme le sujet, la thématique, les auteurs ... C'est ces voies là que vous devriez explorer, si j'ose.

Quel système vous offrent les informaticiens afin de garantir la stabilité des liens vers les documents. Ont-ils un système d'identification particulier?

Dans le cas affirmatif, ceci serait de bonnes nouvelles, car cela voudrait dire que votre collection serait reposable via un système de "link resolver" que le lien vers le Bookshop existe ou pas.

Vaudrait-il pas mieux de se concentrer sur les trous dans nos collections (publications pas dans opoce, études, etc.) au lieu de répéter le travail du OPOCE

CEDEFOP

Pas une politique trop claire de liens. Pas trouvé un seul lien au bookshop (pourtant vu dans le passé!).

Ils utilisent souvent un champ MARC 270 qu'ils ont nommé "Availability":

270 |a Publications Office, 2 rue Mercier, L-2985 Luxembourg, or from its national sales offices |k (352) 29291 |l (352) 292942758 |m info@publications.europa.eu |z <http://publications.europa.eu/>

Une recherche par auteur= dg education et culture (ils ont une belle collection de DG EAC.)

Le plus souvent Ils preferent ajouter tout simplement un lien vers la page du document sur les pages Europa du DG dans le serveur europa (ex.:

http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/eqf/note2_en.pdf ou bien

http://ec.europa.eu/education/more-information/doc/2010/warwick_en.pdf)

Vu les changements reguliers de l'estructure du site web du DG, les liens cassent.

Si CEDEFOP est concerné en tant qu'auteur, il y a le lien vers leur repertoire

<http://libserver.cedefop.europa.eu/vetelib/2010/74793.pdf> souvent accompagné de celui de la DG.

Mais ce qui arrive souvent est que le seul lien donné dans la notice soit celui du site de la DG sur europa. Ce qui est dommage est que, vu que la plupart de ces documents ont été publiés par la DG, eux ils n'utilisent pas le permalink du bookshop ou se trouve pratiquement tous les documents.

Et ce qui est dommage c'est si CEDEFOP repere, catalogue et heberge des documents OP et ne communique pas au bookshop l'existence de ces PDFs.

HOME/JUST:

Hosts EWSI, but this is run by an external partner

What happens when there is no more money? What is the infrastructure behind it? Is it sustainable?

The documents are housed on the various servers of national organisations/government departments.

Send us an email if you have any editorial questions or technical problems. You can also contact the European Web Site on Integration Team by sending an email to integrationwebsite@unisys.com

GRASPE

Graspe Cahiers provide an important source of information in the history of the evolution of the EU institutions.

Graspe is produced by an informal group of civil servants, working during their spare time.

Publications are in PDF, hopefully a long-lasting format (long in the internet world), but the website itself may one day vanish.

Reports cited but not available on Europa?

<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/10/1142&format=HTML&ag=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

Source: Communication Services on the basis of Idate; Broadband developments in Europe", a study for the European Commission.

EO/09/2

29 January 2009

Ombudsman criticises Commission for inadequate register of documents

The European Ombudsman, P. Nikiforos Diamandouros, has urged the European Commission to set up a comprehensive register of the documents it produces or receives.

This follows a complaint from the British NGO, *Statewatch*, about the Commission's failure to register the vast majority of its documents. According to the Commission, the establishment of a comprehensive register is impossible at this point in time, mainly because of the use of incompatible registers in its different departments. The Ombudsman was unconvinced. He considered the Commission's failure to comply with the legal obligation to establish such a register to constitute maladministration.

Mr Diamandouros said: "The European Parliament and the Council have set up satisfactory registers. I, therefore, see no reason why the Commission should not be able to do so. In the current debate on the reform of access to document rules, I called for clearer guidelines on what registers should contain. Unfortunately, the Commission has chosen instead to propose a narrower definition of what a document is. In my view, this will lead to fewer rather than more EU documents being accessible to the public."

Background

EU legislation on public access to EU documents requires the EU institutions to set up public registers of the documents they receive and produce. These registers should have been in place by 2002.

In October 2006, the British NGO, *Statewatch*, turned to the Ombudsman, pointing out that the Commission had failed to comply with its legal obligation. According to the complainant, the Commission's register only contained legislative texts and Commission's reports that had already been adopted. The vast majority of documents was missing. The Commission argued that the relevant legislation did not oblige the institutions to list all their documents. Furthermore, it was impossible to set up a comprehensive register because of the use of incompatible registers in its different departments. The Commission announced, however, its intention to launch a new centralised system by 2010.

The Ombudsman was not convinced. In his view, the Commission had had enough time since 2002 to establish its register. And even a new centralised system was no guarantee of comprehensiveness, he said.

To read the full decision, please go to:

<http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu/cases/decision.faces/en/3728/html.bookmark>

For press inquiries: Ms Gundi Gadesmann, Media and External Relations Officer, tel: +32 2 2842609

Other references which could contribute to a discussion

Blog with information about installing D-Space:

<http://rspproject.wordpress.com/2010/07/28/installing-dspace-on-centos-5>

Draft work programme for the PEWG on EDC's European Electronic Repositories

See also ERPA (European Research Papers Archives)

Sustainable economics for a digital planet – ensuring long-term access to digital information : final report of the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access. February 2010.

(esp p.1 1st para; p11-12 p. 20 21 23 p 26 p 29 p 32-33 and Appendix 2

Note to Directors-General and Heads of Service. Subject: Unauthorised disclosure of documents to third parties. Ref. Ares(2010)252981 – 11/05/2010.

Article 15(3) TFUE Regulation (EC) 1049/2001, OJ L 145 31.05.2001 p. 43 Commission Decision 2001/*937 OJ L 345 29.12.2001 p. 94.

Comment: In order to decide on disclosure or not there must be a repository with clear indications of the status of "documents" which is not the case (any longer) for studies and similar documents.

If a document was publicly posted on Europa – that document should be subject to archive rules and should be included in an official repository and register and not subject to the whims of webmasters or limited by lack of server space.

"Welsh repository network" Platform/hardware revue – most institutions listed in this article are using D-space (other options E-prints; Berkley Press DigitalCommons hosted service)

AgEcon search ...

Note ... Etudes: suivi de l'Audit du Service d'Audit interene. SEC(2003)472
SG/B/1 JTB D(2003) 310100

FP7 project on Open Access and their repository - it has been suggested that Commission staff writing articles which they wanted to be openly accessible could use the Openaire Orphan repository.

In theory it is possible if a person registers but it seems unlikely that individuals would take the trouble to do this

<http://www.openaire.eu/>

<http://openaire.cern.ch/>

<http://opendepot.org/>

Van Sompel

<http://www.mementoweb.org/guide/>

Automatic Aggregation of Faculty Publications from Personal Web Pages

Many researchers make their publications available on personal web pages. In this paper, we propose a simple method for the automatic aggregation of these documents. We search faculty web pages for archived publications and present their full text links together with the author's name and short content excerpts on a comprehensive web page. The excerpts are generated simply by querying a standard web search engine.
<http://journal.code4lib.org/articles/3765>

Questions:

Should Commission departments not be helping OP to ensure that the Digital Library is complete rather than inventing adhoc solutions?

Should the Central Library not be prioritising collection building and access to Commission generated grey literature – to the benefit of both officials and the general public?

Would it be possible to use solutions proposed by Europeana, Openaire or other repositories in some way to solve some of the problems of access, storage and retrieval?

How can metadata, which can potentially be harvested from ECLAS for other applications or from other applications to ECLAS be best exploited? (OP metadata repository?)

How can existing repositories be integrated into any proposed solution?

Sources of inspiration?

D-Space

EAGLE (European Association for Grey Literature Exploitation) liquidated in 2006 produced SIGLE database (funded by Commission) this has become OpenSIGLE and uses D-space.

Aspects to consider?

Information visibility

Findability

Accessibility

Long term archiving (no broken links please)

Material to consider ?

Studies and research contracted/funded by Commission

Annex F

Minutes of an informal meeting of staff from the Secretariat General, DG Communication and DG Education and Culture

Grey Literature: a question of governance? **Summary of the meeting held on 19 October 2009**

Participants: Peter HANDLEY (SG/B5), David Jeffrey HARRIS (SG/B5), Blanca LLINAS TERES (SG/B5), Carol BREAM (EAC/C4), Marco MICHELON (EAC/R6), Bruno FETELIAN (COMM/C2).

The subject under discussion was: how 'grey literature' produced by, or on behalf of the Commission could be stored, preserved, and made visible for discovery and access.

Grey literature is:

- Published in any media format;
- Not covered by the rules and procedures applied to documents (E-DOMEC family of tools);
- Not covered by OP procedures for publications.

Documents/publications appear in any format from paper to digital (e.g. PDF visual audio).

Internal documents are covered by a legal requirement and rules which are applied from the time a document appears in its first draft until it is discarded or stored in the historical archives.

Publications, however, although they are covered by specific work flows which should be respected by the various author services of the EU Institutions, do not always arrive in the OP digital repository. Full coverage will not be achieved without imposing a legal requirement to be applied in the same way as for documents – hence the discussions in the interinstitutional working group on legal deposit.

OP assigns DOI, ISBN, ISSN, Catalogue number, and expects author services to deposit an electronic copy. But this is not always the case, and even official publications of this kind may never arrive in the digital archive despite being published on Europa or related sites.

Grey literature consists of (inter alia):

- Studies
- Reports

- Other deliverables resulting from projects funded by the Commission
- Books deposited as a result of direct funding or programmes, currently treated in the same way as other documents in Ares. But this form of treatment is inappropriate and the items disappear without trace into the archives – or end up on the second hand market.
- Books or articles deposited voluntarily by universities, organisations, individuals, – generally on subjects pertinent to the work of the Commission.
- Books/articles published by Commission staff in various professional/scientific journals. Many staff members are unaware of the guidelines from the copyright unit in the OP on how to handle the legal issues associated with author and publisher ‘rights’.

There is a somewhat hazy distinction between what belongs to the Commission because work for a publication is carried out within working hours, and what belongs solely to the author (work carried out in his own time).

Some authors are happy to deposit their work with the Commission, but currently there is no repository. Like other grey literature, copies can be deposited in local files, on local servers, or even on Europa, but, through lack of any preservation policy, they are not permanently or consistently accessible.

Publications on Europa (and on Intracomm) are liable to disappear whenever the web pages are reorganised. Webmasters resist change in order to keep documents embedded in their web pages. This makes search and discovery tools on Europa (Intracomm) ineffective.

Web pages should be totally independent of the publication store, instead of being, as they are now, the place where publications are stored (or lost).

There should be a permanent repository (repositories) which search and discovery tools can identify.

Tools to manage access rights would reduce any tendency to block access to large numbers of publications when only a few are actually ‘sensitive’.

Both Europa and Intracomm suffer from lack of a single access point to ‘published’ information, and an official policy governing on how information should be stored and accessed.

In order to impose basic rules for retrieval and preservation metadata, there must be an overarching legal requirement on the treatment of information.

Some departments, in the absence of any central guidelines, are creating proprietary tools to apply to publications and documents in their own policy areas.
http://www.cc.cec/home/dgserv/digit/info/bi/doc/sept_2009/dev.pdf

The issue of preservation of information for access is at a critical point. There are too many silos with no common rules. Sharepoint (my intracomm) will multiply the number of places where publications/documents may be stored.

Individuals from a variety of backgrounds are now aware of the problem. Hence the renewed activity on subjects such as Legal deposit, OP Digital Library (part 2 of PODL project), E-mail governance.

Politically, the opportunity is ripe for the taking. President Barosso spoke of the importance of information for his new mandate. High-level recognition and political support for practical action is required to make this vision a viable reality.

'Last but not least, the people's Europe is also about the accountability and openness of the EU institutions People have a right to accessible information'
http://ec.europa.eu/commission_barroso/president/pdf/press_20090903_EN.pdf
p.35

The decision of the meeting was to gather more information on how other organisations cope with grey literature, and to bring together other potentially interested parties for a wider brainstorming session.



CEDEFOP

European Centre for the Development
of Vocational Training

EU grey literature

Long-term preservation,
access, and discovery

Luxembourg:
Publications Office of the European Union

2012 – VI, 57 p. – 21 x 29.7 cm

ISBN 978-92-896-1132-9
ISSN 1831-2403
Cat. No: TI-BA-12-002-EN-N
doi: 10.2801/94634

Free download at:
http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/EN/Files/6115_en.pdf

Free of charge – 6115 EN –

EU grey literature

Long-term preservation, access, and discovery

The preservation of the historical memory of the development of the European Union and its policies, which have helped to mould European history for almost 60 years, has never been more important in a world of rapid change. The growth of 'fast' publication of documents in print or on the various websites of Europa is alarming. A Eurolib working group on EU grey literature was set up in 2010. This first Eurolib Working Paper presents the major findings and recommendations issued after a detailed analysis.



CEDEFOP

European Centre for the Development
of Vocational Training

Europe 123, 570 01 Thessaloniki (Pylea), GREECE
Postal address: PO Box 22427, 551 02 Thessaloniki, GREECE
Tel. +30 2310490111, Fax +30 2310490020
E-mail: info@cedefop.europa.eu

visit our portal www.cedefop.europa.eu

eurolib

6115 EN

http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/EN/Files/6115_en.pdf



Publications Office

ISBN 978-92-896-1132-9



9 789289 611329