EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Information Society and Media Directorate-General

Digital Content and Cognitive Systems

*e*Content*plus*

Intermediate Review Report

Project No.:	**ECP-2008-DILI-518001**
Project acronym:	BHL Europe
Project website:	http://www.bhl-europe.eu
Period reviewed:	May 2010 – October 2010
Review type:	x Based on project deliverables and formal meeting (Option 1
	☐ Based on project deliverables (Option 2)
Names of Reviewers:	Kenneth Bone, Marília Curado
Date of meeting:	30/11/2010

Overall Assessment

1. Summary

Free text giving the reviewers' overall assessment.

The project has achieved the objectives for the period under review, with good quality deliverables being made available within schedule. In particular, the German prototype and a carefully planned and scalable hardware infrastructure have been completed.

Project management has also been of a good quality and the consortium demonstrates a high level of commitment towards the project.

There is still a strong dependence from the content obtained through the BHL US project, but the consortium is devoting efforts to include more content provided by BHL Europe partners.

2. Recommendations

Free text giving the reviewers' recommendations including actions to be taken.

It is desirable that in future deliverables the performance indicators are specified according to the units used in the Description of Work (i.e. "Number of accessible pages of biodiversity literature"), to allow for an objective comparison between reported and reached values.

The implementation of the virtual museum should be planned is such a way that the first "tours" are available as early as possible, to provide for increased visibility of the project, and the consortium should provide a schedule for the deployment of the virtual museum.

Dissemination activities need to be more active to improve the project visibility. In particular, the consortium should carefully plan the definition of the uses cases. Further approaches for dissemination need to be sought.

The consortium should also plan the elaboration of the illustrated book of best practice.

3. Conclusions

X   The project has achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period.

☐   The project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period, but some action should be taken to fulfil the provisions set out in Annex I to the grant agreement.

☐   The project has failed to achieve critical objectives and/or did not fulfil the project work plan as described in Annex I to the grant agreement.

A. Objectives

The objectives for this period were attained and are still relevant and achievable within the time and resources available to the project.

Whilst BHL Europe still has a strong dependence on content obtained through BHL US, this situation has the potential to be overcome as content from the European partners is included in Europeana.

It seems that the performance indicators have been reached, but it is desirable that in future deliverables the performance indicators are specified according to the units used in the Description of Work (i.e. pages – "Number of accessible pages of biodiversity literature"), to allow for an objective comparison between reported and reached values. Nevertheless, the number of web accesses is still very low, and active measures should be pursued to improve actual results.

B. Work plan:

Free text giving the reviewers' comments on the degree of fulfilment of the project work plan as described in Annex I. This might include answers to the following questions:

1. Has each work package (WP) been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I to the grant agreement)?

2. Have planned milestones been achieved for the activity period?

3. Have planned deliverables been completed for the activity period?

4. Do the technical solutions employed reflect the "State of the art"?

The work packages appear to have reached the expected progress with respect to the Description of Work in Annex 1 and planned milestones were achieved.

The technical solutions planned and implemented are state-of-the-art, particularly the hosting infrastructure and the German prototype.

Deliverables were also presented in a timely fashion and have good presentation quality. It should be noted that additional care was taken in the last period to provide detailed information of the tasks performed and that the deliverables from the previous period were updated as requested by the reviewers.

C. Project management and resources

Free text giving the reviewers' comments on the project management. This might include answers to the following questions:
1. Is the management of the project of sufficient quality
2. Has the project implemented an active risk management?
3. Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related projects or other national/international programmes (if relevant)?
4. Have resources been deployed as foreseen in Annex I, overall and for each beneficiary?

Project management and consortium coordination efforts appear to be working efficiently, and significant improvements to management procedures were developed, namely, through a more systematic reporting approach. Also, the interaction with Europeana has been strengthened, as the project coordinator is now directly involved in the Association of German content providers to Europeana.

The consortium has given attention to the risk of remaining tightly connected with the previous BHL project, as identified in the previous review, and is working actively to include content from additional sources.

Resources have been deployed as planned and according to the activities performed. In particular, the NHM has invested on a hardware infrastructure to support BHL Europe content. The configuration of the infrastructure is adequate for the amount and type of content to be integrated in BHL Europe and accessible through Europeana considering also the foreseen types of use and search, both for the content providers and end-users, having a strong potential for scalability at additional reduced costs. It should also be noted that hosting at NHM has not costs for the project, as maintenance, Internet connection and other associated costs, such as energy consumption, are fully supported by NHM.

D. Consortium partnership

Free text giving the reviewers' comments on the consortium partnership. This might include answers to the following questions:
1. *Has the collaboration between the participants been effective?*
2. *Have the partners contributed as planned to the project and tasks assigned to them?*
3. *Do you identify any conflicts or evidence of underperforming partners, lack of commitment or change of interest of any partners? Do you recommend any changes in responsibilities?*

The partners display an active cooperation and synergy, with all partners appearing to have contributed according to their obligations.

Although two content providers were not included in this reporting period, this does not impact budget distribution, as one of them is now performing other activities and the other was not a consortium member. Nevertheless, this situation will be overcome in the next reporting period by integrating additional content providers.

No conflicts and no underperforming partners were identified.

E. Dissemination and awareness activities

Free text giving the reviewers' comments on the effectiveness of the dissemination and awareness activities. This might include answers to the following questions:

1. *Is the project website up-to-date and a relevant source of information for the project activities?*
2. *Has the consortium disseminated project results and information as foreseen?*
3. *Are potential users and other stakeholders (outside the consortium) suitably informed?*

The project website is of relatively high level, which is easy to use and with up-to-date information. Multilingual content is available and multilingual search is possible in six languages.

Dissemination and awareness activities have been reasonable, but more effort is needed in order to improve the visibility of the project for the end-users both within and outside the scientific community. In particular, the definition of the use cases for the next period and the deployment of the virtual museum have the potential to play an important role for the achievement of this goal.

F. Impact and Sustainability

Free text giving the reviewers' comments on the extent to which the project results impact on the specific field. This might include answers to the following questions:

1. *Have intellectual property rights for the underlying content been solved?*
2. *Are there any risks related to intellectual property rights for the project results?*
3. *Are the user needs properly reflected in the user requirements and/or the implementation?*
4. *Does the project contribute significantly to achieving the eContentplus objective of making "digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable?*

Intellectual Property Rights Issues are being sufficiently addressed.

User needs appear to have been identified and addressed.

The project still significantly contributes to achieving the eContentPlus objective of making digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable.

Name(s) of the reviewer(s):	**Kenneth Bone**	**Marília Curado**
Date:	01/12/2010	01/12/2010
Signature(s):		

F. Impact and Sustainability

Free text giving the reviewers' comments on the extent to which the project results impact on the specific field. This might include answers to the following questions:

1. *Have intellectual property rights for the underlying content been solved?*
2. *Are there any risks related to intellectual property rights for the project results?*
3. *Are the user needs properly reflected in the user requirements and/or the implementation?*
4. *Does the project contribute significantly to achieving the eContentplus objective of making "digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable?*

Intellectual Property Rights issues are being sufficiently addressed.

User needs appear to have been identified and addressed.

The project still significantly contributes to achieving the eContentPlus objective of making digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable.

Name(s) of the reviewer(s):	Kenneth Bone	Marília Curado

Date:	01/12/2010	01/12/2010

Signature(s):