

Notes reviewers

Tour de table of all participants, affiliation and role in the project.

WP leaders identify themselves as being present for the review.

Procedure is explained by Marcel Watelet.

First presentation of the results of the project for the first period) not re-explain all the description of work as the reviewers have read it. Need new and recent information for the reviewers to write of the review reports in order to make an assessment of the results in global way.

Points to be attentive to:

Project work plan, clear plan for dissemination activities.

How this contributes to e-ContentPlus.

Interoperable

Improve multilingual access to the content

Interoperable data set

Clear set of production standards.

Cross cultural search

Sustainability plan (already think of it now even if are only in the first year !)

Assessment of quality of technical part.

Cost effectiveness of the resources

All the deliverables submitted, analyzed, website, portals, demonstrators.

Prototypes

Correspondence between commission and Project leader

Risk management

Quality of consortium

Audience

Target users

IPR issues

Clear mechanisms.

Sound Management

3 types of flags (green, Yellow (actions required), red (stop)

1 Henning (see presentation on the wiki)

Presentation on the objectives (no questions so far)

WP1: (see presentation on the wiki)

Questions and remarks:

EUROPEANA meeting 24-25 June 2010 Frankfurt

Slide with indicator (17.4) what is it BHL-US or BHL-Europe providers → both
Not clear from the table which % is gathered from BHL-US and which from EU partners
(calculated it on a page level) and EUROPEANA in volumes, had to check. 16 million
pages from BHL-US and European contributors was 1.6 million pages, will see it at the
pre-ingestion presentation.

BGBM had a project to fund scanning and contribute but as project was rejected will
deliver less than planned. (need to review some figures)

Links to BHL or link BHL-Europe ? →(is link to BHL –US for now)

Within the material contribution lot of potential (but need to distinguish between BHL
and BHL-US) →work closely together to make a joint project for all. Hard to separate.
Very closely joint. , will it be possible to segregate with what is previous and what is new
material?

Adrian: global architecture, there will global data center. Access on geographical basis
or service. Distribution to nodes.

Statistics and metrics from the system.

From a logical point of view. BHL-E be accessible from separate location or same.

BHL-global portal and load balancing.

Google analysis graph (way of quantifying the results of this project, not embedded in
BHL global.

See if Bounce for new content. Indicator of new work done;

Issues : long term vision (API) ?

Vision in the future, tag all individual documents where it comes from and how to be
used. Has the material but need to add how it has been used (metrics)

It is stated that “Content of BHL-E is now incorporated in EUROPEANA”. But It had
not been harvested through EUROPEANA yet ; not accessible yet is ready but
EUROPEAN has not harvested it yet.

Resources employed? Still collecting the financial statement for this table.

Work in progress.

WP2 Henning (see presentation on the wiki)

Questions and remarks:

6 month without WP leader ? what was the impact. ? it is not negligible
WP2 so important. How come did not manage to do some faster reactions;
→ Worked around it at various level. Due the general process to get quality people in time is a common issue. Intensified the collaboration with EDIT (what facilitated the work), delegated some of the work to partners to lower the workload. Also worked with local libraries.

How to deal with the project partners what takes so long to reach an agreement ? → A lot of administrative tasks involved. Still can start harvesting the information of those who have signed already. With so many partners we can not them harvest all the time;

Second progress report; many say that they will not provide content until almost year 3. Why ?

→ Table is ingestion plan. Based on the management of that work. Numbers provided by the partners who signed the MoU.

WP 3

The harvester is configured and working.

How migrate the data from the US to one location, into the repository in Europe ?

→ Mirror of the data; Hosted in the NHML. Maintenance, sustainability plan
Consolidate the architecture in the US. BHL-E also in US. Australia, China.
Feed into EUROPEANA.
BHL global is an ongoing work.

Look from a higher level, is this BHL-E an extension of BHL Global or BHL-E a project as such ? It is what EUROPEANA and Commission want and their needs that have to be done in priority, and then have to be involved in a more global approach. Also important for the sustainability Large exercise to have a shared service environment.

Mapping of standards, which format each partners has his own format?

→ this has been done by BHL-E.

That is controlled by their local systems. Number of issues, tools and ways the ingestions can be done. Pre-ingest how it is mapped this and how in comes in. → use case scenarios?

Two views

What languages to provide: is an automated process (nice and vocabulary)

Local species in local names, through a look-up table, to use latin name.

What was the commitment. German/English.? Concerning the DoW?

This is an Infrastructure for global portal. Pay attention because this long list could be interpreted as a commitment to deliver.

How many partners in BHL (how many of the BHL Europe was partner of BHL-US and BHL-E ?

Most difficult is BNF because both deliver to BHL-E and EUROPEANA.

What is new content ?

What is already in EUROPEANA. only BNF is also directly partner to EUROPEANA.

And they are harvested at the moment.

Naturalis, also in STERNA also available to EUROPEANA ? how is it dealt with.

In STERNA content is made available, limited subset only limited in birds. → Identify by having a global identifier ?

WP4

IPR : it is not a law, is not a rule; is a suggestion for a best approach.

In most cases is free 70 years after the death of the author.

Which license to apply (CC0) CC PD (public domain), more is a flag on how it can be used.

Guidelines, so that institutions do not all contact the editors for the same thing too much; batched together.

Items integrated so far BHL-E have been tagged, has been done. Not analyzed yet.

We have IPR information from every partner and take that into account.

Sustainability for free availability of the content is the bulk of the project

BHL-E consortium, where is this content inserted. New content, where is it now?

→ there is no production portal for but a prototype, and brought in from the US. Every partner has its local repository from where it can be harvested.

WP5

Dissemination, Exploitation and Evaluation

Posters, power points, can be used as template with their own content examples.

Dissemination activities, sent it around.

List of conferences.

Tools newsletter not just for the partners, but also broader public. 4 times a year

Published (various)

Press releases, articles in journals

Present in EUROPEANA working groups

User surveys

Deviation from the plan put in place BHL-Europe exploratory survey

Editorial tools causes some delays in updated the website (will be done in two weeks)

In general a good job but small details caused issues:

- Editorial tool : easy problem that has become an issue. → IT person quite busy. Want it in a database.
- Website is still only in English. Prepared text in other languages ok, but not in place. Link to original website. (minor) but improved.
- Better selection of images

Second part presentation :

About us

Outcomes

Events and planned

News

News letter (subscription)

Related projects

How many subscribers (corresponds with our contact, 100)

Is a mixture, collect them in one database

User survey (2)

16 questions launched in March 2010 in cooperation with BHL-US.

Reach quite numbers of users

Also involve general audience

Frequent users : looking at the categories: what was the motivation to do this?

→ Very objective : useful to have this

Need to have the distinction.

A frequent user will give very different answers and remarks than a new or irregular user.

Presentation on Sustainability (Graham)

No direct question on the presentation just a remark that it proves that non-EU content is very useful for Europe

General questions remarks at the end of the presentations

Table : do not have the efforts of this during the last 6 months

How you justify if they have no clear contributions?

Justify there work

→ Things to do before the ingestion. Content analyses (but this needs to be explained more clearly) ,

How much of the content has been virtualized, what have they done

→ Have content available. (but need figures)

Looking at the numbers. Efforts spend to to what ?

At which stage are the partners Do usages of resources, efforts and task done match ? .

Made task allocation on the information we got, description of work.

Compare to budget allocation match.

Progress report number 2, (they all contribute 0 ?)

Negotiations , also partners that are not content providers;

Newly acquired content, new partners, extensions. ? how will this be dealt with ?

Incorporate content from others with help of the partners.

Says that “16% of literature available through EUROPEANA, but has not harvested it.

Ready to be harvested by EUROPEANA (is not the current figure)

Needs to be changed

Even is it s a technicality, even if it is weeks or days away (must be as today in the report and presentations)

Performance indicators (by none scientists)

Assuming that people will first got to Wikipedia and find BHL)link there. Example of usages, not a workflow.

Usage of BHL content is presented in a too vague manner in the reports.

Want to see case studies rather that more general things.

Quantifies it better.

Need the data to fully support the figures, do not have these case studies, need more details on the figures. To show what has been provided, needs to be incorporated in the next progress report.

Reconvene after reviewers discussed separately.

Results of the review BHL-Europe: Cannot give you a red., but cannot give green. But yellow

Most deliverables met (as actions need to be taken)

- Positive, coordination has been done very well. As a consortium has access, also technical model. Good presentation of deliverable, presented on time, good layout. All very enthusiastic about the project. Pleased on the progress, hardware infrastructure. Very of global vision of BHL which needs to be encouraged within certain parameters. But not affect the actual deliverables. In general we are very pleased, but
- share the comments, really pleasure to see how work together; one issue is BHL, looks like it is a BHL 2 not BHL-Europe. Too much dependency from BHL global. The information you pass, should delivered for BHL-Europe and not BHL-US. Data and so on. Need to see the information from BHL-E specifically and could not see it.
- Multilingualism : only one language from 1 to infinity. Should be careful, very effective way, but not all as shown will be there by the end of the project. Stay realistic.
- Management and organization of activities, WP2. is a pity was without leader for such a long time and that it took more than 6 months to hire a new person. Editing tool and website delays to update it, no project server, these also are minor issues that should not have such a high impact and that in no way should delay a whole project to that extent.
- Assess on how the resources were spent for efforts, need to have this information to assess it.
- Set of content providers are there but is not shown, at this stage, several partners have provider , what is the status of their content, need more information from which content from which partners.

Recommendations :

Main issue, on paper, on deliverables, seems to be too dependent on BHL global or BHL-US and from a funding perspective. Is that what you share with BHL is the name and get content, but cannot be a continuation for the BHL project. Seems to be an addition to BHL. Have to make it clear of the achievements made by BHL-E/ Not demonstrated it on paper. Too much dependent on BHL, statistics and than sense is extending BHL is not a EU funded project is a problem. You do not need to ignore it, but separate clearly what is BHL already and what is done by BHL-E now. You do not say which are new, which are already available, not possible to say how many pages created. Need to detach yourself. Not be twins. If there is an issue with BHL itself, your project becomes death in the water. You have to separate from them on paper, can quote, can do questionnaires; need to see segregated data, making comparisons.

Revisit the deliverables in this sense. When done this separation, need to see more detailed information. Which need info on the format, on the standards, who will do the work ? This data are needed. Case studies need to be specific. Have to be careful about mistakes in the text. Have explained it. Not quote it as an actual figure. Not nice to have in an official document. Obvious mistakes need to be avoided.

Make sure BHL is an external source and be more granular in information provided. Would like to see statistics, samples. , those statistics need to be more granular too.

Deadline, as 3 specific deliverables need to be changed

D2.4 need it revised and remarks.

D1.2 modify and update.

D.13 annual report have to modify and change mistakes and issues.

Must reflect exactly the work done.

Recommend to organize a new review in 6 months after the submission of the German prototype. → 1 July to revise the 3 deliverables)

Is this ok ? does it affect the financing ?

Reactions , Consultative comments.

BHL-E consortium though it was important to show the global, worldwide picture to guaranty visibility of Europe and sustainability;

EU reviewers and EU know that the work was done, but need reports, documentation that is done, show more details; Can only judge on the reports and documents, not on oral explanations and guessing.

Do not sacrifice information to show global view. Need to get paid for that.

Do not have the proof.

Understands it. Collect information to rewrite it. Will do an additional review in November.

will also set up few more indicators.

In two weeks the official report. But begin to revise the deliverables directly.

Do all the partners need to be present again?

→ normally just WP leaders and some key people to be there and when, Where need to be discussed. It does not necessarily need to be a face to face review, could also be done remotely.

Next regular review for year two will go as planned even with an additional review in November.