

eContentplus

Project Type: Content Enrichment Project for Cultural and scientific/scholarly content

Project Number: CP-2005-CULT-038024

Video Active

Creating Access to Europe's Television Heritage

Content Selection Strategy Report Deliverable nr. 2.3

Project start - end date (duration)

01/09/2006 - 31/08/2009 (36 months)

Name of Lead Contractor for this Deliverable: Royal Holloway, University of London

This project is funded under the *eContentplus* programme¹,
a multiannual Community programme to make digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and
exploitable



¹ OJ L 79, 24.3.2005, p. 1.

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Deliverable number: 2.3
 Deliverable title: Content Selection Strategy report
 Contractual date of deliverable: May 2007 (Project Month 9)
 Actual date of deliverable: 17 August 2007
 Author: Rob Turnock
 Participant: RHUL
 Workpackage: WP2
 Workpackage title: Selection Strategies and Alignment
 Workpackage leader: RHUL
 Dissemination Level: Public
 Version: final
 Keywords: content selection, editorial strategy, commissioning, quality assurance

HISTORY OF VERSIONS

Version	Date	Status	Author (Partner)	Description/Approval Level
01	04/07/2007	Draft	Rob Turnock	
02	06/08/2007	Draft	Rob Turnock	Reviewed by Pelle Snickars, Frédéric Bruart and Stephane Bayot
03	14/08/2007	Final	Rob Turnock	

ABSTRACT

This deliverable outlines the developments in content selection policy since deliverables 2.1, 2.2 and 3.1, proposes an editorial strategy for how to combine historical approaches of the study of television with the historical study of Europe, and proposes number of editorial mechanisms for commissioning and quality assuring a range of articles between now and the project's completion in Month 36.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Document Information.....	2
History of Versions.....	2
Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
1 Summary	4
2. Towards a Thematic Approach to Content Selection:	5
3. Onward Development of Content Selection:	6
4. Editorial Policy:	9
Appendix 1: Controversial Themes.....	14
Appendix 2. Element Set for New Tool	165

This report will focus on the development of the content selection policy for the Video Active project. In doing so it will address some of the problems and challenges that were outlined in Deliverable 2.1 (*Initial Report on Comparative Archive Material*) and will build on the response to those challenges described in Deliverable 3.1 (*Initial Report on the Content Selection Process and Metadata Mapping*). In particular, Deliverable 2.1 identified a number of key challenges. These were the variability of archive holdings amongst the content providers for the project (across both historical periods and genres) and the variability of rights restrictions and policies across the archives (demonstrating variable legal and legacy conditions in different broadcasting situations and national territories). There was also variability of access to supplementary content and metadata by the content providers. These issues remain key stumbling blocks for the development of Video Active as a coherent and comprehensive resource for a broad range of potential users. Deliverable 2.1 also raised a number of questions regarding the editorial policy towards the commissioning and quality assurance of contextualising and explanatory articles relating to the audio-visual content (and in some cases absence or lack of access to it) in the project.

This report will therefore begin by looking at the development of a thematic approach to content selection and will look at the operational problems raised by the initial selection exercise undertaken by the content providers using a number of themes. It will then look at the development of a data management tool that was needed to respond to the problems raised by this early research and selection of content. It will also refer to ongoing discussions about the design of the Video Active web portal and how this should be integrated with data management and search functions.

The report will show how the provisional approach to content selection, historical themes, has been consolidated by a number of operational factors, and has also been validated by the academic consultation/conference held in London 19-21 April 2007 (see deliverable 2.2, *Report on Academic Consultation and Conference*).

It was originally proposed in Deliverable 2.1 that Video Active integrate two key approaches to content selection using a combination of both archive programme content and a range of text and articles. These two approaches were the historical development of television across Europe (history *of* television in Europe) and the representation of developments and events in European history on television as they happened (European history *on* television). While Deliverable 2.1 proposed to integrate these two approaches, it advocated the use of programme content that emphasised and explored the history of television in the first instance. This report, however, will propose that the two approaches to history here will be more effectively addressed by separating out the functions of exploring Europe history on television and the history of television in Europe by the different use of programme content and written text. It is therefore proposed in this report that the thematic approach to content selection will allow the development of a rich resource that explores the history of Europe using television archive content from across a number of genres and periods. The report will propose that this content will be complemented by the use of high quality and strategically commissioned text and articles that explore the comparative and national dimensions of the development of television in Europe. This does not necessarily mean the crude bifurcation of content – with programmes representing a general history and articles representing a specialised history of television. It will be the purpose of the editorial strategy proposed here to ensure that the relationship between programmes and articles is one of complementarity and harmony, and this report will outline the strategies for achieving this throughout the project right up until month 36. Given the need for an additional data management tool and for further discussion about functionality and design,

content selection - and related editorial decision making – will continue to be an ongoing, responsive and reflexive process.

2. TOWARDS A THEMATIC APPROACH TO CONTENT SELECTION:

At the Project Management Board (PMB) in Athens 18-19 January 2007 it was agreed that a provisional set of criteria for content selection should be developed to allow the archive partners to begin the large task of research, viewing and selecting programme material for the Video Active project. This was in part an extension of a simple experimental research exercise devised by WP3 and conducted by the content providers over December 2006 and January 2007 to look into national content related to Christmas and national holidays. This was effectively aimed to be a ‘dry run’ of actual research and selection, and to give both the content providers and WP2 and WP3 a sense of what kind of material would be selected and where potential problem areas might be. As a subject theme it was also topical (seasonal) and also provided an interesting snapshot of national and cultural variations towards a shared calendrical event. Started as a simple exercise, it quickly became clear that the sheer scale of the archive material held by the partners meant that researchers needed very carefully worked out and clearly defined criteria to be able to sort through the mass of different programme forms that make up television schedules. Even a simple theme such as Christmas or seasonal programming potentially relates to the fullest range of programme forms that cover the 50 or so years of the project. The scale of the subject not only presented archive researchers with an enormous task it raised questions about representativeness and comparison. The problems experienced by the content providers were reported to the PMB in January and it informed discussions about how content selection should be organised and undertaken. As the simple Christmas exercise demonstrated, a crucial advantage of beginning the research process early, is that it allows project partners to quickly identify problem areas that can be resolved strategically by the PMB and the work packages closely connected with management, content selection and alignment (WP1, WP2 and WP3).

The outcome of the discussion at the PMB in January has been described in Deliverable 3.1 (*Initial Report on the Content Selection Process and Metadata Mapping*), but the aim of initial content selection was to try to compare ‘like with like’ in a rigorous and scientific manner. This is particularly problematic when, as reported in Deliverable 2.1, the different archive partners hold different programmes in different genres for different periods. This variation in holdings across the project is further complicated by the different rights issues relating to the different broadcasters across the project countries. This makes the task of comparing programme materials across all genres, across all the project countries and across all the six decades (1950 – present) that the project covers impossible.

The response to this challenge was to develop a grid that contained 43 historical themes over six decades (see Deliverable 3.1 for the list of themes and for the detailed briefing notes for each theme). It was agreed at the Athens PMB that a first round of content selection should include the selection of clips or programmes for these themes and was to be undertaken and completed by April 2007 in time for the London consultation and conference. It was calculated that if each content provider selected 20 clips or items for each of the five topics (spread as evenly as possible across decades and from an available range of genres) then by the conference each would have achieved 100 items towards their total commitment to the Video Active project. This would be a substantial achievement and demonstrated that the thematic approach would at least offer a sensible and practical way for achieving the project’s quantitative target.

By the time of the London conference in April the content providers had undertaken their research, made their selections and recorded the data on Excel spreadsheets. This now constituted information about 1,000 items of archive content. It represented a success in terms of the content providers’ ability to research, select programme material and to record information, but this created a new challenge – how to make sense of all this information? How to measure it in terms of the historical aims of the project? It was

well understood that the uneven nature of the archive holdings (historical spread and genre) and uneven access to it (rights) would make it necessary to assess and review the kinds of clusters and gaps that would inevitably emerge in the programme materials. Such assessment would be crucial to compare content (actual programme material) and to ensure that the content selected was complemented by appropriate written based material. Furthermore, the assessment would be vital for commissioning written text/articles for areas for where no archive content was available, and it would be important for the commissioning of broad, strategic overview articles that would allow wider historical comparison of the development of television (and general) history across Europe.

The ability to analyse and understand the data being produced by the content providers was to be a major issue for discussion after the London conference. This was crucial because it not only impacted on the development of the Video Active project but also has major consequences for the functionality of the project for the potential range of end users.

3. ONWARD DEVELOPMENT OF CONTENT SELECTION:

Both during and in the wake of the London conference there have been a number of developments in the design and implementation of the content selection policy.

3.1 Consolidation of thematic approach

The thematic model was an approach that had been designed provisionally to allow the archive content providers to begin the large task of researching and selecting programme content for the Video Active project. At the same time it was perceived as a potential route to overcoming the difficulties posed by the variability of archive holdings and the rights and legal issues pertaining to them. Since the thematic approach was conceived in January a number of issues have determined that it remains the primary model for archive research and selection. Firstly, the content providers have been successful in identifying a wide range of material for uploading to the Video Active web portal once the contribution tool is in place. Secondly, the archive partners are satisfied with the process of selecting content based on historically related themes – and this seems to tie in with a range of other research activity and policies that the archives undertake and implement. There are, however, some limitations to this which this report will return to below.

Thirdly, academics at the London conference and consultation (see Deliverable 2.2) understood the practical difficulties that the project faces and appreciated that a comprehensive educational resource based on genre and historical spread was unrealistic. There was interest in the thematic approach as a practical route into organising and understanding the material. This route was presented to the delegates as a sensible strategy, but one that was also dependent on the presentation of appropriate and high quality contextual material and articles. It can be read, therefore, that support for the thematic route is conditional on an effective editorial strategy that furnishes the Video Active web portal with intellectually sound and quality assured written content – and this will be discussed further below. Fourthly, the academic partners themselves have been keen to develop further themes for the archive partners to conduct research into. At a meeting following the conference in London, for example, academic colleagues from Utrecht (WP2) proposed a series of themes that looked at sophisticated and complex social and cultural phenomenon. At the same time, Utrecht and RHUL academic colleagues have been in discussion about developing themes that more explicitly tackle the issue of television history (see Appendix 1). Yet negotiation with the archive content providers about some of these themes has been complex – and this relates to some of the potential limitations of the thematic approach to be discussed below.

Fifth, a recent survey conducted by WP3 amongst the content providers has ascertained that password protection for specialist academic and educational users is not the way (for a range of operational and legal reasons) to unlock access to audio-visual content bound by rights restrictions. This will inevitably impose a restriction on access to programme forms such as drama where there are numerous and complex third party rights issues. This will mean, in effect, that content providers such as the BBC will be restricted to providing factual material (such as news, documentary and current affairs programming). This development further supports a content selection based on historical themes as news and documentary is often perceived (rightly or wrongly) as a direct route into understanding events and social and cultural movements as they took place.

As a result, through a combination of operational expediency and sound intellectual principles the thematic approach to content selection has been consolidated as a key strand in the onward strategy. Nonetheless there have been some potential stumbling blocks to the development of this approach – although it is likely that these aspects would surface whichever approach to the subject matter was undertaken. The first difficulty relates to the representation in the project of the history of television in Europe. Feedback received during PMB meeting held in Budapest on 4-5 June indicated that while archive researchers are very happy to undertake research into historical themes they sometimes feel less comfortable in aligning their own historical values towards programme forms and clips with different academic values in areas such as textual analysis and aesthetics. The historiographical issue of value is a particularly complex and problematic one as it inevitably changes across national boundaries, broadcasting systems and academic disciplines. When looking at news footage, for example, an archivist or historian might be interested in the events or people being represented, whereas a television or media studies scholar might be more interested in the aesthetics or mode of representation (such as production practices, technologies, styles of framing and linguistic discourses etc). Part of the interesting tension that Video Active reflects is the way that television and media historians seek to probe and challenge the standard kinds of canons and typologies often defined by broadcasters (and therefore broadcasting archives). So this means the development of research criteria that integrates both broadcasting and archive notions and ideas about television with academic ones. The innovation and challenge of Video Active is the way that television studies scholars and archivists are working together towards common goals, and this means that the project involves collaboration and knowledge exchange that transcends professional and national boundaries. This inevitably requires discussion and negotiation.

A related difficulty has been the choice of the historical themes themselves. During the Budapest PMB meeting the next five themes were proposed for the content providers to start researching. Following discussion between the academic partners in the project, five new themes of research were proposed that specifically focused on the history of television - these aimed to look at areas of controversy in television and also to look at programmes about television (see Appendix 1). The five themes, however, presented a number of operational difficulties for the archive partners. These were the depth of the archive holdings relating to the theme, the value-judgements that archive researchers might have to take in looking at issues of ‘controversy’, and the difficulty of revisiting areas of legal, political and broadcasting sensitivity. This latter difficulty was particularly apparent when other research themes were proposed – including one about nationalism. One of the archive partners raised an objection to looking at the issue of nationalism as it was deemed too politically sensitive. Having already researched and identified suitable material on the subject of drugs, alcohol and tobacco, there was a concern at the partner institution that the content of Video Active would dwell too much on negative issues or subjects that might be harmful to the institution or the country. This demonstrates the sensitivity in undertaking shared historical projects of this kind. This may become an even more critical area in the future when it is considered that much of the content of the project may have to be news, documentary and factually based. It has long been recognised by television historians, analysts and social scientists that news on television is rarely ‘good news’.

The five themes that were proposed in Appendix 1 were collapsed into two themes: Controversial Television Programmes and Television about Television, and a further five were agreed for the content providers to work on. These are (please see previous briefing notes in Deliverable 3.1):

Education

European Integration

Wars and Conflict

Religion

Food and Drink

As in the previous round of research and selection, archive researchers have been asked to look for 20 items for each theme – spreading them evenly (where possible) across the decades for which they hold material. The researcher will also be required to capture a large amount of information about the clips and programmes they select – and this includes assessments of typicality and relevance for other thematic areas. The information will be recorded in the new data management tool developed especially by WP4 (see data management below), and the content providers will be expected to achieve this by the beginning of project month 13.

3.2 Data management:

As outlined above, one of the problems that has arisen in content selection is how to analyse the mass of information that is being generated by each of the content providers. It was agreed that an additional tool needs to be developed to assist with the analysis and management of the information being provided by the project archive partners, and this has been developed by WP4. There are several reasons for the development of this tool. Firstly, there needs to be consistency in the information being provided by the content providers (this is important as it allows for the possibility of effective comparison). Secondly, there needs to be a standard template to allow the content providers to provide this consistent information quickly and efficiently. As indicated earlier, archive researchers have been uncomfortable in making academic assessments about the programme material they are researching. As a result, a simple template where a researcher can indicate the typicality or exceptionality of a particular programme – through a tick box mechanism that integrates both archive and academic models of thinking about television, for example – will drive researchers to make such assessments quickly and comfortably.

Thirdly, all this information needs to be analysed to identify where there will be aggregations or clusters of particular programme material. These aggregations may be based around, for example the use of particular forms of technology, around genres, around programme styles and forms of representation. The identification of such clusters will facilitate comparison between different forms of content and it will facilitate the identification of subject areas to be written about and published on the web portal. Not only will clusters show important areas to be explored and understood, but it will also show where there are significant gaps and absences (this will be discussed further in the section on editorial policy). The tool will also make it possible for those involved in the development of content selection (Utrecht, RHUL and ORF) to be reflexive and responsive to the information being generated. The management of this information will make it possible to make tactical interventions to encourage more of a particular type of material, for example. Fourthly, the information architecture being developed at this stage will have important consequences for the functionality of Video Active for the range of potential users.

To facilitate the development of such a tool WP2 developed an element set, with contributions from expert colleagues in WP7 which were the focus of discussion at the PMB in Budapest (the details of this element set are in Appendix). There was extensive discussion of the fields that were to be used in the new tool and a final list was agreed and the work was undertaken by WP4. On the week beginning 25 June a version of this new tool was launched and disseminated with technical instructions to the content providers. This included details of how should fill in the fields and also how to transfer data from the existing Excel sheets on which they had input their information about the first five historical themes. Until this has been undertaken it will not be possible to start to analyse and make assessments about the material that has been researched. WP3 and WP4 will provide further details of their activity, but this clearly demonstrates the way in which content selection will have to be an ongoing and responsive process.

3.3 Design, Functionality and Research Journeys

What will be key to making the Video Active website a valuable learning and cultural tourism resource will be functional and well designed front pages that allow the user to find the content and information they want quickly and efficiently. There have been a number of discussions between WP1, WP2, WP5 and WP6 about this and the outcome is still subject to further discussion and agreement. Currently under discussion are a number of filters and cluster mechanisms and search functions and route into the material which focus on European television history axes. The proposed axes are currently:

Television Memories and Cultural Identities

European Television and Europe on Television

Trade and Technology

Media Events and Television Rituals

Television Spaces and Places

Popular Watching and Cultures of Viewing

Stars and Styles

4. EDITORIAL POLICY

An important part of the Video Active project will be the articles and essays that explore, contextualise and explain the audio-visual content that is presented on the web portal. As previously discussed, the content selection policy has increasingly come to be determined by a thematic historical approach to the research and selection of audio-visual archive material. This therefore places greater need on an editorial policy that provides not just contextual information about the themes being depicted but that addresses a key aim of the project to offer a comparative history of television in Europe. This section of the report will outline a number of important issues relating to editorial strategy and policy. It will identify the different levels of article required by the project, it will then go on to discuss the format, content and tone of these different articles, and it will conclude with a proposal for the commissioning and quality assurance of articles.

4.1 Thematic Tiering of Articles:

There are a number of different kinds of articles that are required for the Video Active web portal (this is of course in addition to copy that supports and promotes the Video Active project and site).

Strategic overview articles about the development of television in Europe: This would include articles about developments of international or transnational scope. Examples might include the development of the European Broadcasting Union, issues of technological standardisation, international legislation relating to communications, or issues relating to programme exchange and trade (and this might also include material about the relationship between Europe and America). It is also likely to include comparison of the development of television around Europe, such as the historical development of broadcasting institutions, trends in programme making, genre evolution or the rise of celebrity cultures in different countries.

Overview articles about the development of television at a national level: This might include articles about specific broadcasters, national broadcasting legislation, national programme-making and viewing cultures. Some of these articles might refer to developments in other countries or relationships with other countries, and they may involve some level of comparison, but the aim is to inform the Video Active user about issues in television history in a particular country.

Articles about particular content: These would most closely relate to the content being provided by the project archive partners. For example an individual content provider may offer clips or extracts from a well-known programme from that particular country, and therefore an article exploring the importance of that programme would provide a valuable resource for the Video Active user.

Articles for where there is no content (strategic and national level): In many instances there will be no archive content available and it will be an important ongoing review of the content selection policy to identify areas for where material is lacking. This will be particularly the case for genres such as drama or comedy where rights prohibit the selection and presentation of material or for where no holdings exist. Articles can be used to make up for the lack of audio-visual material to help build a comprehensive picture of the development of television in Europe.

Strategic overview articles about historical developments in Europe: This would include articles about developments of international or transnational scope. It would include historical overview/comparative articles relating to the themes that have been developed as part of the Video Active content selection policy, such as drugs, alcohol and tobacco, developments in housing, the rise of immigration or the development of welfare policies.

Articles relating to historical developments being depicted in programme content: These too would closely relate to the content being provided by the project archive partners. An individual content provider may offer clips or extracts about an event or social development from that country's history, therefore an article exploring the importance of that event or development would provide a valuable resource for the Video Active user.

As previously indicated, many of the articles cannot be determined until the results of the archive research has been undertaken. The special tool developed by WP4 will be extremely important in this area. Nonetheless, the editorial team to be proposed below can take a pro-active role in commissioning work at a strategic level and national level.

4.2 Format, content and tone:

There are two particular challenges relating to the format, style and tone of the articles for the Video Active project. In the first instance, as referred to earlier, a password protected system to allow privileged access to material for scholars and students has been rejected on the grounds that it is impractical and technically difficult to implement within the project timescale, and that it presents different legal issues in each archive/national context. There is also little confidence that a password system would guarantee the necessary IP protection that the different rights holders would require. One of the impacts of the rejection of password protection/privileged access is that it removes a rationale for the creation of a dedicated space or part of the web portal for the tertiary education sector. The Video Active project will still provide a valuable resource for people working in and studying in that sector, but given that the development of the thematic approach engages with themes that are traditionally outside the remit of media and television studies, the contextual articles will need to address a wide range of disciplinary constituencies. Added to this is the value of such material for use in the secondary education sector across a range of subject disciplines, and also for educators in the primary sector who may want a contextualized understanding of individual clips or programmes before using them in the classroom as part of their teaching. Furthermore, the Video Active web portal should also appeal to members of the general public who might be considered 'cultural tourists'. This means that articles will have to appeal to a wide range of users.

Secondly, the style and content of articles should address the medium specificity of the Video Active project. In an internet literate mediascape, a website that consisted of long pages of text would be very off-putting to a wide range of users. Nonetheless it has also to be recognised that web pages often contain a vast amount of text based information. So the second challenge is provide written information that is web friendly for the wide range of users outlined above.

To meet these two challenges there are two proposals. Firstly, it is proposed that all the articles should be written by academics and archive specialists. The second proposal is that written contributions to the Video Active project should be made up of a combination of short and long articles. These articles should be aimed at an informed and literature readership, and writers should be expected to produce interesting, intellectually stimulating and factually accurate material. The model here is very much along the lines of the *Encyclopedia of Television* (which is now available online at: <http://www.museum.tv/archives/etv/>) whereby experts write expository material that provides the reader with an introduction to the subject and offers references and routes to further reading and study. This will mean that writers should adhere to a certain standard of academic practice referring to original authors where necessary and of providing a relevant further reading list. Academic colleagues in Utrecht (WP2) are currently devising a handbook for such written work. Short articles can address the six tiers of articles outlined in section 4.1 above, though it is likely that commissioned articles that take a strategic and comparative overview of television history and European will be of a longer length. Long articles may be of a length around 1,000 words and short articles 300 words. Longer articles are also likely to include a short list of keywords (to facilitate a number of comparative searches and journey) and to include hyperlinks to other articles or directly to the project's audio-visual content. The rationale for these figures is that the technology partners have indicated that these are the optimum lengths to allow for embedding (or hyperlink connectivity to) actual clips and sequences within the article texts. Importantly, short and medium length articles should also be in English.

4.3 Commissioning process and quality assurance:

It is proposed that there will be a two strand system of commissioning articles for the Video Active project. This system will operate under the administration and guidance of an editorial team who will

ensure that not only are the appropriate articles commissioned but that the material written is of a high standard. In the first instance the editorial team will be made up by the two academic partners in the Video Active project (under WP2). These are Utrecht University, whose project staff are Professor Sonja de Leeuw, Dr Andreas Fickers and Dana Mustata, and Royal Holloway, University of London with Professor John Ellis, Dr Cathy Johnson and Rob Turnock. This editorial team will also be supported by an advisory panel made up of members of the European Television History Network.

Long articles: The commissioning of long length articles will be agreed by the editorial team with a given individual taking on the responsibility of contacting and dealing directly with the writer. The work submitted by that writer will then be read by two members of the team, or if it is outside the subject and national expertise of the team, it will be read by one team member and passed to a member of the advisory panel for comment. It will be in this way that a high quality of writing, intellectual and academic rigour is ensured at the strategic and comparative level of the project. To facilitate the smooth running of the editorial team, Rob Turnock at Royal Holloway will act as editorial leader to co-ordinate and keep a record of the materials commissioned, submitted and read. What has yet to be decided is who will be ultimately responsible for posting the article to the Video Active web portal.

Short articles: It is likely that short articles will be commissioned directly by the content providers. The archive content providers have many close links with academics and specialists, and they are well situated to commission material locally. The content providers will themselves be responsible for posting the article to the project portal via their contribution tools, but each short article must first be submitted to the editorial leader who will ensure that the article is of high enough standard and conforms the criteria laid out in the article handbook (being designed by Andreas Fickers at WP1). As well as ensuring that the article is intellectually sensible the editorial leader will ensure that the article is written in a competent level of English. It means that the submitted article will have been reviewed by two people – the original commissioner who will have local/national subject expertise – and the editorial leader who understands academic practices and who can ensure consistency across the project.

Three key approaches will be employed to locate and recruit writers for the different articles. Firstly, members of the project solicit contributions from colleagues and peers from their personal and professional networks (such as through personal contact and conferences). Secondly, a number of disciplinary networks and subject associations will be contacted to solicit contributions from a wide range of academics and specialists both inside and outside the immediate Media and Television Studies domains. In particular contributions from academic colleagues working in areas such as history, politics and may be sought. Thirdly, it is anticipated that there will be a link on the project web portal for potential contributors to contact the Video Active team directly and in most cases the editorial leader will forward such enquiries directly to the content providers. (In rare cases where the editorial leader might commission and receive short length articles directly he will approve the article before forwarding it to the relevant national content provider. It will then be the content provider's responsibility to ensure they are happy with the locally produced article before uploading it via their contribution tool.)

The priority for the editorial team is to agree and commission a number of strategic overview articles for the launch of the Beta site in project month 14. Furthermore, once the content providers have uploaded their research findings to the tool developed by WP4, the editorial leader will be able to make a first assessment about the kinds of clusters and aggregations of material that has been selected, and then report back to the editorial team to then discuss and agree on areas for commissioning – both at the central/strategic level and at the local/national level. The editorial team will then be able to advise individual content providers about the kinds of articles that would be desirable, or the issue could be raised at a PMB meeting for collective action across the project partners.

The research, selection and uploading of audio visual content will be taking place throughout the project duration and as a result it is anticipated that the editorial team and the editorial leader will also be commissioning and reviewing short and long articles throughout this period and right up to project month 36.

APPENDIX 1: CONTROVERSIAL THEMES

These are the briefing notes that were drawn up by WP2 to be added to the previous briefing notes devised by WP2 (see Deliverable 3.1 for details).

These notes were issued to content providers 24 April 2007 and were the cause of discussion at the PMB in Budapest – raising issues about availability and sensitivity.

Instructions – five new categories

Each content provider should research and locate 20 programmes or clips that explored or illustrated each theme – **from a range of genres** (where possible) **for each theme**.

These 20 programmes or clips (for each theme) should be distributed evenly across the decades for which the content provider holds material. (For example, an archive that holds material dating back to 1960 would have four programmes or clips in each period, whereas an archive that holds material dating back to 1990 would have ten programmes or clips for each period).

The new categories:

- Controversial television programmes: political and historical
- Controversial television programmes: public taste and standards
- Controversial television programmes: production practices, regulation and law
- Television about television (contemporaneous)
- Television about the history of television

Controversial Television Programmes:

Programmes or clips from or about television programmes that have provoked controversy. This could include programmes that have caused political, press and public outcry or which have been subject to censorship, banning, or which have resulted in legal or regulatory action. Such clips or programmes might involve the treatment of sensitive or controversial themes from the present or the past.

Material should be drawn from the three distinct areas:

1. Political and historical:

This should include clips or programmes that explore politically sensitive or controversial themes from the present or the past. This might include state or government intervention in broadcasting practice, the exposure of incompetent or inappropriate political conduct, the demythologization of key or iconic political figures, the revelation of military or civilian misdeeds during wartime or periods of conflict, the examination of collaboration or complicity in repressive political regimes. Examples in a British context might include the banning in 1965 of the Peter Watkins drama documentary *The Wargame* about the effects of a nuclear war on Britain or the 2004 controversy about the BBC's handling of a government report and the 'resignation' of the BBC's Director

General Greg Dyke. Where such clips or programmes do not exist, or where they are subject to prohibition, secondary clips or programmes which refer to or explore the original programming could be used in its place.

2. Public taste and standards:

Clips or programmes that are seen to offend ‘good taste’ because they transgress social or cultural taboos. This might therefore include the representation of sex (and/or sexuality), the inclusion or representation of violence in a range of programme forms (including drama, comedy and news reporting), the inclusion or use of ‘bad language’ (profanity/swear words), the representation of religion (ranging from representation of religious institutions to issues of ‘blasphemy’) and the representation of race. This too could include clips or programmes from the past (representing practices that might cause controversy today) or the present, and would include a wide range of television programme forms. An example of a British television programme that caused particular controversy was a 2001 edition of the satirical/spoof documentary series *Brass Eye* that tackled the sensitive subject of pedophilia. Where such clips or programmes do not exist, or where they are subject to prohibition, secondary clips or programmes which refer to or explore the original programming could be used in its place.

3. Production practices, regulation and law:

Clips or programmes that were controversial because they transgressed rules or expectations about production practice, because they transgressed regulatory guidelines and procedures or because they broke laws (for example, censorship, libel or defamation). Examples from the UK might include a spate of 1990s controversies about factual and documentary programmes that included fake participants or that staged or faked sequences that were presented in some ways ‘as real’. Another recent example of controversy surrounded expensive and unreasonable telephone charges for would be contestants to television quiz and gameshows. Where such clips or programmes do not exist, or where they are subject to prohibition, secondary clips or programmes which refer to or explore the original programming could be used in its place.

Television about television

4. Television about television (contemporaneous)

Clips or programmes that explore aspects of television. This might include an examination (for example a news report) about the developments of new technologies or new television services. It might include features about new forms or trends in programming. It might also include the kinds of programmes where viewers write in to voice approval or complaints, or review programmes where journalists or experts review or preview new programmes in the coming week or months.

5. Television about the history of television

Clips or programmes that examine the history of television (either at home or abroad). Such material might look at the development of television socially and culturally, or developments in programme technologies or programmes. These clips or programmes might celebrate particular television anniversaries (such as the recent 50 year anniversaries of some European broadcasters), or explore the development of popular programmes and genres. There is also currently a trend for clip and interview shows about favourite programmes from particular years or decades.

APPENDIX 2: ELEMENT SET FOR NEW TOOL

This was the element set devised by WP2 (dated 8 May 2007) with revisions in coloured green and blue added by technical experts in WP7(dated 14 May 2007).

This was discussed and revised at the Budapest PMB meeting and forms the basis of the data management tool that has been developed by WP4.

Video Active Proposed Element Set

Rob Turnock

8 May 2007/ slightly revised 14 May 2007

This element set has been drawn up by the Video Active project partners (UU and RHUL) following a review of the existing Excel template devised by Alexander Hecht (ORF) and used by the content providers to list the material they have identified and proposed, and following a discussion about a number of additional elements.

This new list therefore integrates the old and new elements with the development of a number of new sub-categories of information to be represented in the software under consideration by a number of tick boxes and drop down lists.

The order in which the elements are listed here is only indicative and subject to discussion and agreement.

Programme Information:

1. Programme title in original language: [Title]
2. Alternative title in original language [Alternative title]
3. Programme title in English (please repeat the title here even if the title was originally in English): [English title]

4. [Subject]	Keywords in native language (from archive catalogue)
5. [Abstract]	Abstract in original (native) language
6. [Description]	Description in original (native) language
7. [Keywords]	Term from the thesaurix (added as soon as CT is ready)
8. [Creator]	Production company etc.
9. [Publisher]	The archive partner
10. [Rights]	Copy right information
11. [Spatial coverage]	Term from the thesaurix (added as soon as CT is ready)
12. [Relation]	Links to other assets (optional)
13. [Source]	Name of the archive
14. [Identifier]	Caralogue number

15. Episode or edition subtitle in English (if applicable)

16. Date of creation **[Date of creation]**
17. Period covered (content) **[Time coverage]**
18. Date or original transmission: dd/mm/yyyy **[Date issued]**
19. Clip or programme **Drop down box** Clip
Whole programme
20. Running time/length of clip or programme: **Numerical values**
21. Original language of clip/programme: **[Essence language]**

Drop down boxes

Catalan
Danish
Dutch
English
Flemish
French
German
Greek
Hungarian
Italian
Swedish
Welsh
Other

NB More than one language can be ticked.

22. Short Description in English: **Text description** **[English abstract]**
23. Contributor: **[Contributor]**

Production Information

24. Production platform: **Drop down box** Film
Video
Originally Live (production and tx)
Originally live + telerecorded
25. Colour or black & white **Drop down box** Colour
Black & white
26. Production space: **Drop down box** Studio – without audience
Studio – with audience
On location (recording)
Outside broadcast (live)

Significance of clip/programme to Video Active project:

27. Was the programme typical/representative or exceptional, unusual or innovative?

Drop down boxes

Typical Typicality may be reflected across a number of areas. It is therefore proposed that researchers can enter the item in up to three areas. So there should be [three drop down boxes](#) with the following areas listed in each one:

Typical programme style for genre
 Typical subject for genre
 Typical treatment of subject
 Typical use of technology/studio location etc
 Typical treatment of participants, celebrities etc

Exceptional Exceptionality may be reflected across a number of areas. It is therefore proposed that researchers can enter the item in up to three areas. So there should be [three drop down boxes](#) with the following areas listed in each one (with following sub-categories of drop down boxes)

Seasonal special (eg Xmas)
 Unusual experimental programme
 Exceptional/one-off *event*
 Popularity (most popular /more popular than other television)
 People [drop down boxes](#) celebrities and stars
 Politicians/ power
 Ordinary people
 Innovation in television [drop down boxes](#) People (how used)
 Production
 Genre
 Style
 Technology

28. National/European dimension:

Drop down boxes:

Regional culture/issues
 National culture/issues
 International – reference to other part of Europe
 International – reference to other part of the world
 Programme or format that has moved across European borders
 Programme or format from outside Europe

29. Additional information: (eg availability of stills, KBAs scripts etc).

Programme classifications

30. Genre:

[Drop down boxes](#) News and current affairs [Drop down boxes](#) News
 Current affairs

		Live events
Documentary	Drop down boxes	Observational Factual Reality TV
Drama/fiction	Drop down boxes	Single drama Series/serials Soap operas Docu-drama
Shows and entertainment	Drop down boxes	Music Quiz Gameshows Variety
Comedy	Drop down boxes	Sketch Stand up Satire Sitcom Other
Children	Drop down boxes	0-5 years 6-12 years 13-18 years
Lifestyle and magazine	Drop down boxes	Talk shows Magazines Cookery Homes & gardens Fashion Other
Other	Drop down boxes	Interstitials Adverts Sports Other

31. Topics

Some clips or programmes might sit across a number of topics. It is therefore proposed that researchers can enter the item in up to three topics. So there should be [three drop down boxes](#) with the following topics listed in each one:

Agriculture
Art & Culture
Catastrophes
Capitalism
Celebrity
Civil Society

Cold War (Military)
Cold War /East – West Relations
Colonialism – Post Colonialism
Competitions
Consumer Culture
Controversial television programmes – political and historical
Controversial television programmes – public tastes and standards
Controversial television programmes – production practices, regulation and law
Crime
Democratisation
Drugs/alcohol/tobacco
Education
Emigration/Immigration
Energy
Environmental Issues
European Integration
Family (including divorce)
Fashion
Folklore
Food and Drink
Gender revolution
Globalization
Housing
Industry / Manufacturing
Internal Conflict (Civil Unrest)
International Relations
Leisure
Living in cities
National Holidays
Nationalism
Religion
Sexual Revolution
Sickness and Health
Sport
Technology
Television about television (contemporaneous)
Television about the history of television
Terrorism
Transportation
Wars / Conflict
Welfare State
Work
Youth Culture