EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Information Society and Media Directorate-General

Digital Content and Cognitive Systems

eContentplus

Intermediate Review Report

Project No.:	**ECP-2008-DILI-518001**
Project acronym:	BHL Europe
Project website:	http://www.bhl-europe.eu
Period reviewed:	November 2010 – April 2011
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:	08/06/2011

Overall Assessment

1. Summary

Free text giving the reviewers' overall assessment.

The project has achieved the objectives for the period under review, with very good quality deliverables being made available within schedule.

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

The consortium followed recommendations from the previous review and special attention has been given to the clarification of the performance indicators.

Whilst performance indicators related to the visibility of the content made available by the project were modest, the consortium has planned activities to overcome this situation.

2. Recommendations

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

The consortium should carefully monitor the progress in year 3 of the project to be able to recover the performance indicators not fully achieved in the period under review. It is recommended that the activities for the third year of the project are further detailed, including task definition and scheduling for all partners, with at least a monthly granularity to provide suitable monitoring support during this phase.

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

Free text giving the reviewers' comments on the degree of achievement of the project objectives as described in Annex I. This might include answers to the following questions:
1. *Have the objectives for the period been achieved?*
2. *Performance indicators: have the targets been reached?*
3. *Are the overall objectives still relevant and still achievable within the time and resources available to the project?*

The objectives for the period under review have been achieved and are still relevant and achievable within the time and resources available to the project.

Performance indicators have been specified according to the units used in the Description of Work as suggested in the previous review. Most performance indicators have achieved the proposed targets and some were even higher than planned. However, the performance indicators concerning the amount of metadata sets to be imported into the GRIB, number of interconnected repositories and page views, both through BHL-Europe portal and Europeana are still bellow the expected values for the year 2 of the project. The consortium has identified these issues and has planned activities to tackle them. It is of utmost importance that the progress towards the fulfilment of the expected performance indicators is closely monitored to allow for a successful outcome of the project, with particular attention to the amount of content available through Europeana.

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. Whilst the reviewers have checked the content available through Europeana, they were not able to access the GRIB in order to assess its functionalities, which would have been desirable.

All the deliverables were presented in a timely fashion and have very good presentation quality, having adequate depth and detail.

However, it is expected that deliverables in general contain more specific and detailed planning for the third year of the project, including defined indicators and targets to be reached, possibly in perspective of the indicators provided at proposal stage. Such information will ensure that the consortium can more easily monitor progress of the project in the third year towards the ultimate achievements expected at the end of the project.

The technical solutions employed are state-of-the-art, following commonly accepted procedures and applying existing standards.

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. Nevertheless, the planned activities for the third year of the project should be further detailed, including task definition and scheduling with at least a monthly granularity to provide suitable monitoring support during this phase.

Risk management procedures have been adequate and the consortium has undertaken satisfactory measures to identify and address the issues encountered.

Interaction with Europeana has been active and coordination efforts have been successful.

Resources have been deployed as planned and according to the activities performed.

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 collaboration between the consortium participants seems very active and complementarities have been explored in an efficient way, with all partners appearing to have contributed according to their planned roles.

Additional content providers have been sought and four non-BHL Europe content providers have signed a Memorandum of Understanding towards the contribution of digital content to BHL-Europe.

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 high quality, with a modern design, easy to use and with up-to-date information.

Dissemination and awareness activities have been reasonable and should be continued in the third year of the project.

First steps towards the deployment of the virtual museum have been carried out, with the creation of a virtual museum on the "world of spices". It is desirable that this task is pursued with the creation of further exhibitions targeting a broader audience.

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 and new agreements with rights holders have been achieved.

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: 14/07/2011   14/07/2011

Signature(s):