BHL-Europe Annual Review

Date: 27.05.10

Reviewers: Marília Curado, Kenneth Bone

Starting Date: 1.05.2009

End Date: 31.04.2012

Process:

1. Presentation of the Work
2. Concerns writing of the Review Report

Assessment of project by reviewers using following criteria:

- Quality of the technical part
- Financial report
- Data reliability & sustainability

End of Review:

Green Flag: objective and technical tasks achieved

Yellow Flag: most tasks were managed

Red Flag: stop of project !

Presentation of Work

Questions & Comments:

Presentation – WP1 (Henning)

1. Performance indicators (Maria): which content was provided from BHL and which one is provided from Europeana. Reviewer has problem with not using the same measurements (volumes and pages were used)
2. WP1 Usage by non-scientists: Question about linkage. Would there be linking from Wikipedia or from other sites to BHL without BHL-Europe?
3. Table of performance with old content and with new content.

   Reviewer: Is the content created by BHL-Europe created from one place or from different places?

Adrian: Content comes from different places, but is shown in one URL. Adrian compared it to Google, where content is stored on different servers in different locations, but only one website is visible to user

Need to have a better / specific indicators of why users are using BHL-Europe and why for e.g. there are using only one site (e.g. first page) and then go away (graphic dashboard 51. Bounce Rate)

➔ Take more care about user statistics and get a more detailed view to this kind of analytics!

4. Comment by reviewer: BHL-Europe is continuing BHL and using Europeana
5. D 1.2 Table is empty
6. Concerning WP2- Why did it take so long to recruit a new WP2 leader?
   WP2 is so important, how was it not possible to have a faster reaction
   Difficult to get qualified staff, due to organizational problems. Tried to work around: intensified work with EDIT and delegated some of the work to the partners to reduce work overload.
7. WP2 – originally were 17 content providers, but only 13 signed. Other 4 are also partners, but why does it take so long to reach an agreement with those 4.
   Henning: Trying to understand all partners individually and this is a difficult task.
8. Is it possible that all CP contribute the Content within the time frame (3 years), because only few data is already harvested:
   Henning: Yes
9. Does the late recruitment of WP2 leader affects the budget, because of the delegation of work to other partners?
   Henning: No

Presentation- Adrian Smales- WP3

10. What was the pay-back for IBM to provide help?
    Adrian: IBM gets value back from NHM, as there are interested in such relationships. NHM has a good relationship to IBM.

11. Where are the servers hosted and does it cost more?
    Adrian: hosted at NHM, doesn't cost more because NHM is a partner of the project.

12. Comments of reviewers: if BHL-Europe gets content from US than it would be good if it also works the other way around

13. From the technical point of view: are you looking at BHL-Europe alone or is it a part of BHL?

14. How dependent and how independent is BHL-Europe from BHL itself?

15. Have you already identified which partners have what kind of metadata?
    Adrian: yes, we have already.

16. Different metadata standards are going to be managed by you or by CP?

Adrian: both, depending if CP can manage to provide what we need, depending on costs and if the partner can allow to do this. Otherwise we will harmonize the metadata from our site.

17. Realistically what languages are you going to provide?
    Adrian: all languages shown in "Prototype Status & Progress" slide, because it's automated done

18. What was your commitment in terms of multi-language:
    Adrian: English, German prototype, but we can deliver as well other languages and would like to

19. You are also going to pass information to Europeana which is not yet in Europeana?
    Adrian: yes, we try to work together with them

20. How many partners of BHL-Europe were previously partners of BHL?
    Henning: BnF

    ➜ Reviewers want to see the value of BHL-Europe. (They want a difference between BHL-Europe and BHL)
    ➜ Which content is BHL-Europe content and which is BHL content. Important reviewers want to see new content

Presentation – WP4 (Nancy)

21. Negotiation of licenses is up to each partner?

22. The items/content that has been integrated into BHL-Europe is already marked with the right license?

23. Regarding sustainability: Conflict between freely available content and the given project time (funding). What about after funding?

24. There is content in BHL and there is content provided by BHL-Europe consortium. Where is the content from Europe?

    Content is still at the repositories of the CP because not harvested yet.

Presentation –WP5 (Jiri)

25. Reviewer: good job done until now
26. Concerning the editorial tool: weakness
27. Concerning the website: it is still in English.
            On website, many links first put a small description and then the link
28. How many subscribers at this time?
    Jiri: 1000

29. What was the motivation for the ranges and the options of question 1 of the survey?

e. g: C: 1 per month D: 6 in 6 months, there is no real difference, because it is the same.

➔ Use better categories

30. All the respondents were users of BHL?
    Not all (Answer F not)
31. How was the selection of the users?

    Contacted different societies

    Comment reviewer: BHL is popular in the field

    Purpose: what can be improved and set the priorities for items that need to be improved.

Presentation – Use Cases (Boris)

No Questions

Presentation - Impact and Sustainability – Graham

32. Comment: BHL global is a lovely vision, but you have to look at this as an extra part. Take
    care what is promised in the contract and after that you can go global. Keep your priority on
    what you promised first.
    For the 2. Review: we do need clear metrics for the next review.
    Comment: EU is only paying for the European level -> so concentrate first what you need to
    do in Europe.
    EU wants more clear metrics, more clear focus on primary objectives !
    After these tasks has been done, the global level can be done additionally (China,....)
    Make sure that the global level is not shown as a focus. The commission wants to see the
    European level more.

Presentation – Future Work- Henning

33. How will you justify the work of the partners, although there is no ingest from the partners
    until now (Table Europeana ingest plan)?
    Henning: we need first to get the structures after that we can ingest

34. Does the budget for each partner reflect the content contributed by each partner?
    If we compare the table of the ingested content from each CP than does it match to the
    budget table for each partner?

35. Progress report 2: complete list of partner which are not specified already
    Table in presentation: only partners who are already fix

36. Comment concerning last table in last presentation:
    66% of literature is available in Europeana is wrong as Europeana does not have the content yet.
    Conflict: Page views through Europeana is 0 but 66% of content is available in Europeana. This doesn't work. Change this!!

    More questions after all presentations:
37. What are the performance indicators?
    Henning: for e.g. General public is going to Wikipedia and there they find the link to BHL

38. Only vague information about case studies. Case studies should be defined : which people, where and what they did. Provide more information regarding the case studies, as commission needs more/detailed facts!

Results from the commission:

Yellow flag: fulfilled most of the objectives of the projects.

Positive: very happy with the very large consortium, coordination seems to work good
- You have technical knowledge
- Presentation of the deliverables good
- Progress of hardware structure
- Positive thing is the global level, but it should not impact the project

Negative:

- The way the commission got BHL-Europe (from the presentation), is that it seem to be BHL2
- Deliverables should be for BHL-Europe and not BHL
- Reviewers need to see the information of BHL-Europe not the information of BHL
- Multilanguage: effective way of using language, realistically not all languages (shown in the prototype) are really needed
- Regarding WP2: bad that there was no leader such no long time
- Regarding Management: data for efforts spent during the 2. Period should be provided
- Which content from which partner

Suggestions:

- On deliverables we seem to be to dependent from BHL
- From the project perspective, all we share is only the name, it seems to be a continuation of BHL
- Make clear what we achieved for BHL-Europe
- Presentations are rotating around BHL (users, content, statistics)
- Separate clearly what is on BHL already and what is new in BHL-Europe.
- Unable to say currently how many pages did we create ourselves
- Divide BHL and BHL-Europe!!! at least on paper!
- Commission wants to see separated data.
- More detailed information (standards, metadata, mapping)
- Which CP has what kind of data and how will this be mapped.

- Case Studies: analysis of case studies should be better.

- Avoid obvious mistakes, such as 66% and o in the table , which is contradictory (table presentation Henning)
- Consider BHL as an extensus
- More detailed : -questionnaires e.g. samples of questionnaire, more valid
- statistics!

Marcel: rewrite 3 deliverables

- D2.4
- D1.2 modify, better documentation, add information
- D1.3: modify information, change mistakes, this report must reflect exactly the work done

New review in 6 months after the submission of the german prototype

Deadline for revision for the 3 deliverables: 1. July!

General Conclusion of reviewer:

We did what we needed to do, but we need to prove it on paper! Primary focus should be on what is promised to do. In order to get the money, you need to prove on paper e.g." if you promise a car don't deliver a house." (reviewer) [which means for us, if we promise BHL-Europe don't deliver continuation of BHL]