

INFORMATION SOCIETY TECHNOLOGIES

(IST)

PROGRAMME



FINAL REVIEW REPORT

E-CULTURE NET

Final Project Review 18.06.2003, Luxembourg

Project acronym: **E-CULTURE NET**

Project full title: **European Network of Centres of Excellence for Research and Education in Digital Culture**

Proposal/Contract no.: **IST-2001-37491**

Date and venue of review: **18 June, Euroforum, Luxembourg**

Reviewers: **Derek Law, Antonella Fresa**

CONTENTS

1. REVIEW REPORT: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
--	---

APPENDIX 1: INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER REPORTS

REVIEW REPORT OF REVIEWER 1.....	7
----------------------------------	---

REVIEW REPORT OF REVIEWER 2.....	12
----------------------------------	----

APPENDIX II: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND REVIEW AGENDA**ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED**

1. REVIEW REPORT: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Introduction

IST-2001-37491 E-CULTURE NET is a Thematic Network project funded under the 7th IST Call for Proposals. Its start date is 1st July 2002 and it is due to finish on 30 June 2003. This was the 2nd and final review of the project and it was held in Luxembourg on 18 June 2003.

1.2. Review procedures

The reviewers were Derek Law, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK, and Antonella Fresa, project consultant, IT. Derek Law was reviewer at the previous review. The review meeting was chaired by Maurizio Lunghi, DG INFSO/E5 (project officers for ORION).

Reviewers were selected, notified to and agreed by the project in due time before the review. Project work programme, consortium description, list of review deliverables, progress reports and review guidelines were distributed by the Commission to reviewers and, in the case of the guidelines, to the project more than 3 weeks before the review. Review deliverables were distributed electronically by the coordinator directly to the reviewers, on the basis of the list agreed with the Commission.

1.3. Present at the review:

The review was attended by the following partners: the core partners of the consortium, two reviewers, the PO from the EC.

1.4. Deliverables

Attached to the agenda there is a list of deliverables completed since the last review; they have been submitted to the review team on time.

The review assessed the progress of work and compliance against the workplan, the quality of the results, contribution to and synergy with state of the art and standards, dissemination and exploitation potential, and project management.

CONSENSUS REVIEW REPORT

PROJECT ACRONYM: E-CULTURE NET

DATE : 18.06.2003

Reviewers: Derek law

Antonella Fresa

SUMMARY OF REVIEWERS' CONCLUSIONS

1.5. Compliance with objectives and workplan

The project is assessed as compliant with its global objectives and workplan. The project team has made strenuous efforts to address the comments of the previous review. In order to become more than a preparatory study, the consortium needs to devote the remaining time and resources to the completion of a concrete exploitation and dissemination plan for the near future.

1.6. Quality of deliverables, approach and methods

The consortium has responded positively to the recommendations of the previous review. Nevertheless, the need to retain focus on the scope of the network remains. The documentation is substantial and comprehensive, which is to be commended, however it is not suitable for dissemination purposes (see point 1.3 below).

1.7. Exploitation and dissemination

Being a final review, exploitation and dissemination would have been addressed in the light of the network beyond the EC funding. This perspective was poor. A high profile has been given to the project through conference presentations and papers but this is opportunistic rather than a plan and therefore insufficient to plan for the future. Valuable information from the deliverables should be transformed into advocacy documents for the benefit of the targeted community.

1.8. Management including usage of resources

Usage of resources is as planned. A stronger emphasis on self assessment processes would help the consortium in planning for any future work.

Reviewers' Recommendations - Overall recommendation:

- X Successful completion (*no further work required*)**
- Continue (without major modifications of the work programme)**
- Modify (the work programme - as recommended)**
- Red Flag (if there are major organisational changes and/or a major reorientation of the project is likely to be requested - at this point the project is halted until the Red Flag situation is resolved)**

Recommendations for future work:

- ? Improve the planning for exploitation and dissemination beyond the life of the current EC funded project.

Signatures

Reviewer: Derek Law

Antonella Fresa

Project Officer: Maurizio LUNGHI

APPENDIX I. REVIEWER REPORTS OF REVIEWER 1 AND REVIEWER 2

REVIEW REPORT OF REVIEWER 1

July 1, 2003

Glasgow

Derek Law

0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project review covered the period corresponding to the 2nd period of the project (January 1st, 2002 – June 30, 2002). The project has a contractual duration of 12 months.

The review aimed at assessing the fulfillment of the project work plan, the achievement of the project objectives, the fulfillment of the deliverables, the appropriateness of the resources employed, the use of reasonable endeavors and the likelihood of the achievement of the results and their potential for wide dissemination.

The review took place on June 18, 2003, at the European Commission in Luxembourg, EUFO building, and was carried out through a series of presentations of each deliverable, following an overview and tour d'horizon by the Project Co-ordinator. The review team then met separately to consider its reactions, then met again with project representatives to report back.

The review team received from the partners a comprehensive report, both in writing and verbally, on the progress status of the project and the discussions which followed the presentations were open and constructive.

General conclusions :

- ? The project addressed the program objectives

- ? All deliverables were provided on schedule and in full, except as specified below

- ? The project is to be complimented on its full and helpful response to the modification of deliverables proposed at the previous review
- ? Project performance with respect to the "Description of work" was as expected.
- ? The project would benefit from considering a structured approach to dissemination of results and preparing advocacy documents beyond the life of the project.
- ? There were no major problems in terms of project management/co-ordination. Indeed this was a group that worked well together and shared an exciting vision.
- ? The reviewers considered that there were no elements which might give rise to reasonable doubts as to the use of reasonable endeavors by the contractors to achieve the expected results of the project.
- ? The reviewer considers that the consortium has taken account of potential synergies with other projects.
- ? The exploitation potential of results depends on a clear articulation of goals and "cherry-picking" material from the deliverables to create a framework for advocacy,
- ? The information dissemination reported is considered average in respect of methods to be used, means, events, publications, media coverage and technology transfer activities. There is clearly wide dissemination, but it does appear to depend on the chance of receiving invitations to speak or publish, rather than being planned

On the basis of their findings, the reviewer recommends that the Commission find the project suitably completed, subject to the following points:

1.1 Compliance with objectives and workplan.

The project is very short in timescale and small in resource terms. A large consortium was assembled, which made management a major task. It was then gratifying to see the project meeting objectives, complying with the workplan

and indeed in some cases delivering more than was required by the workplan. It is considered that the work undertaken was satisfactory.

It was particularly gratifying to see the way in which the consortium had taken heed of the discussion at the first review and had not only amended deliverables as requested, but had used the comments as a basis for some conceptual rethinking.

1.2 Quality of deliverables, approaches and methods

The list of deliverables as shown on the project website was:

Deliverable
No
Deliverable title
Delivery date
8
Research Topics re: Implications
Mo11
9
Topics for European Masters
Mo11
10
Define Content Pilots
Mo11
11
Foundation for Distributed European Electronic Resource (DEER)
Mo11
12
Conference 2
Mo12

Those shown as month 5 were presented at the first review. Deliverables 1-6 are written documents and Deliverable 7 (Conference 1) was given as an oral report, although the conference programme is available on the conference website. In addition at the first review, the reviewers received an early draft of Deliverable 11.

For the final review, the reviewers received deliverables 8-11 and an oral report on deliverable 12 (Conference 2). In addition the reviewers considered deliverables 4 and 6, which had been revised in the light of comments made at the initial review meeting in February.

In general deliverables 8-11 prepared in the second half of the project have been produced as prescribed. Some editing of duplicate text had taken place; Deliverable 6, the Identification of Broadband Pilots was significantly recast and now forms a solid piece of reporting. Deliverable 11 has also been significantly recast from the draft seen at the first review and shows clear signs of significant development in thinking

The reviewers noted that an exit strategy was now in place, although the preferred option remained continuing funding under FP6.

1.3 Exploitation and dissemination.

Dissemination continues to rely on an opportunistic but extensive record of conference presentations and publication. The reviewers continue to feel that a more planned approach is necessary and that the project documents should be examined in the light of this need. It may be that cherry-picking the documents will allow the creation of material and presentations which might better be regarded as advocacy than reporting of results.

1.4. Management including usage of resources

The project has an excellent team, which is performing well together, judging by the review day. The enthusiasm of the group has been a notable feature of its work. Although the review took place before formal and final reporting of financial performance could happen, there is no indication of any problem on this front and we expect the usage of resources to be completed without problem in due course.

2. 2. COMMENT ON DELIVERABLES DUE IN MONTH 11/12

Deliverable 8: *Research Topics re: Implications*. This document used the evidence gathered from Deliverable four to identify two substantial thematic clusters of potential research activity. This is a helpful and productive approach which also allows numbers of small projects from various sources, to be aggregated around the overarching theme.

Deliverable 9: *Topics for European Masters*. This had been prepared well ahead of schedule and considered at the first review. Essentially the position was updated. There was some discussion of the (regrettable) need to consider extending studies into the area of reconstituting as well as refurbishing cultural organisations following military destruction or social upheaval.

Deliverable 10: *Define Content Pilots*. Again a solid piece of work which highlighted some very interesting areas which have notable synergy with advanced computer graphic techniques.

Deliverable 11: *Foundation for Distributed European Electronic Resource (DEER)*. In some ways this was the most important deliverable of all. The fact that it had also been presented in an initial state at the first review proved extremely helpful, since it allowed the reviewers to see how thinking had modified and developed in the intervening six months. The interim approach or DEED has

much to commend it as an attainable goal. The representation of the DACOs element of this deliverable also satisfactorily clarified both its fit with the DEER and interoperability with other datasets

Deliverable 12: *Conference 2*. This had been held only two days before the review and so it was impossible to expect a written report. A satisfactory oral account of the event was given.

3. Overall Conclusions

This was a very ambitious project which used a large group of participants from several countries. There was a tendency to focus on the larger vision at the expense of completing the individual work packages, although this issue was addressed following the initial review in early February. The particular concern remaining is that of dissemination. Although a great deal has been done to describe the larger vision of the project, insufficient attention has been given to the usefulness of the products of the individual work packages. These contain much detailed information which could usefully be made more widely available and much information which could be used for advocacy of the larger vision which the group embraces.

Overall the project may be considered to have performed adequately.

REVIEW REPORT OF REVIEWER 2

Pisa July 21, 2003

Antonella Fresa

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The final review of the e-Culturenet project was held in Luxembourg on the 18th of June 2003, within the premises of the European Commission.

A large representation of the consortium partners attended at the review meeting providing a rather exhaustive presentation of the activities carried out along the project period and the achieved results.

The project execution lasted 12 months from the 1st of January 2002 until the 30th of June 2003 and therefore it was not possible to assess the project final reporting during the final review, since it was not yet delivered at the time.

The aim of the final review was to assess the contribution of the project to the IST programme objectives and to the specific targeted key action, as well as the fulfillment of the objectives and the implementation of the workplan against the description of the work contained in the Technical Annex. In particular, the following aspects have been considered by the reviewer: deliverables, approach and methods, exploitation and dissemination, management and usage of resources.

The reviewers received the set of deliverables, expected by months 11 and 12, with the exception of the report of the second conference, which took place just before the review meeting.

In general, the reviewer finds that project significantly contributed to the objectives of the programme.

Project objectives were generally met; in particular the following aspects were addressed:

- The identification of a set of relevant research topics in the digital culture, through a survey on expertise, projects and demos in Europe and in the NAS;
- The outline of the most urgent priorities in order to focus teaching on these topics and
- The selection of interesting pilots using existing contents, where the research topics are experimented.

The project have been found mostly adherent at targets and timescales as defined in the Technical Annex.

A good progress was demonstrated towards priorities and recommendations given at the previous review.

Even if the final reporting was not yet available at the time of the review, the reviewer has no specific concern about the completion of the project within the available frame of resources.

General dissemination about the project was performed by the partners. The reviewer finds that a more focused approach would have been beneficial towards the further exploitation of the results, in particular beyond the EC funding period. Consequently, the project consortium should be recommended to work on this aspect, even after the completion of the contract with EC.

Project management was reasonably executed. The reviewer considers that a more active role of the project manager in leading the consortium towards a self-sustainable strategy could help the project to enhance its potential impact, that otherwise seems to much dependant upon the availability of EC funding.

On the basis of the above considerations, the reviewer recommends that the Commission considers the project successfully completed, in the light of the complementary points provided hereinafter.

2. COMPLIANCE WITH OBJECTIVES AND WORKPLAN

The project objectives as described in the Technical Annex are considered to have been substantially achieved.

Because of the large dimension of the consortium and because of the high ambition of the general objectives, the project goals necessarily remained often at a rather general level.

For the possible further actions, beyond the current EC funding, it is recommended that the partners agree on focused, precise and measurable objectives.

2.1 Quality of deliverables, approaches and methods

The reviewer received and assessed the deliverables due after the first project review, i.e. the following ones:

Deliverable

No

Deliverable title

Delivery date

8

Research Topics re: Implications

Mo11

9

Topics for European Masters

Mo11

10

Define Content Pilots

Mo11

11

Foundation for Distributed European Electronic Resource (DEER)

Mo11

12

Conference 2

Mo12

The deliverables due in months 11 address topics which are rather different and, in general they are considered to have addressed the identified subject in a sufficient manner.

Deliverable 8: Research Topics / Implications

A set of disciplines is selected and the implication of the new media on these disciplines is studied and described through examples.

The deliverable content can be an interesting basis for possible further dissemination of the project results.

Deliverable 9: Topics for European Masters

Deliverable 9 seems to address the question of the European Masters on a basic level.

The reviewer suggests that the matter of harmonizing the European education on the issue of the digital cultural could deserve further study and elaboration. This matter could be, for example, the subject for a future harmonization work of among the academic partners.

Deliverable 10: Define Content Pilots

The definition of the pilots is interesting and it represent a sound basis for possible further deployments.

Deliverable 11: Foundation for Distributed European Electronic Resource (DEER)

The specification of the DEER (Distributed European Electronic Resource) is rather ambitious and in order to achieve a concrete dimension would need definitely other partners resources to be spent. Unfortunately, the partners did not present their own concrete plan for the further implementation of the project results. The reviewer recommends that a plan for implementation is studied and possibly agreed among the partners who intend to continue the work on the DEER.

The Consortium presented an 'exit strategy' (as recommended at the previous project review), which however remains fundamentally linked to the hypothesis to receive additional support from EC.

Deliverable 12: *Conference 2*

Concerning deliverable 12, it should be noted that the reporting of the second Conference at the time of the review was only verbal.

In fact, the conference took place just before the review meeting and therefore it was not possible for the project to complete the full reporting. The oral reporting was satisfactory.

2.2 Exploitation and dissemination.

The consortium demonstrated to have participated to several events, but the general approach (why to participate to a certain event, which results to be produced through this participation, who will care for the follow-up of the contacts established, etc.) appeared often vague and not fully specified.

In particular, the reviewer recommends that a thorough analysis of the project results should be done, in order:

- to identify which contents could be further exploited and disseminated, and towards which target,
- which are the potential 'alliances' to be established in the light of this exploitation (other European networks?),
- which are the public events to concentrate on (the number of possible events is so high that a selection and a preliminary plan is recommended, in particular when the EC funding will be no more available).

2.3 Management including usage of resources

The project consortium is composed by a large number of important European institutions.

Naturally, the project management requested a rather heavy amount of work. The final results demonstrated at the final review and through the final deliverables shown a good team spirit, which could be a concrete asset for the future development of the network.

In the light of a possible self-sustainability, the reviewer recommend that the partner agree among themselves on a clear set of terms of cooperation, on the basis of which, the next development of the network and of its activity could be carried on.

3. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The project was short in duration (12 months) and very large in consortium dimension (8 contractors, plus a large number of members, experts and global networks).

The management of the consortium required necessarily a high amount of work and the enthusiasms expressed by the partners who attended at the final review is very appreciated.

Overall the project may be considered to have performed in line with the Technical Annex.

In order to better valorise the results achieved, the reviewer recommends that:

- the consortium identify the parts of the documents produced in the frame of the project and find a viable way to disseminate them (e.g. through establishing cooperation with other existing networks which also operate at European level),
- the partners who are willing to continue the network work together on the definition of a clear and concrete strategy of the sustainability of the e-Culturenet, focusing on targets and highlighting benefits for the participants.

APPENDIX II: List of participants and review agenda

Cost statements for the second period are requested in a draft version in order to explain resources use to the reviewers (the consortium will have time to finalise this for administrative tasks with the Commission).

12:00 Discussion of work carried out: compliance with objectives and the work plan; technical issues, including approach and results; management, dissemination and concertation; consequences of delays or deviations; impact of results and exploitation.

13:00 Lunch

(4) Meeting of the review team to discuss: initial impressions regarding assessment; formulate preliminary recommendations

(5) Presentation of the initial comments and recommendations of the review team to the Consortium.

16:00 Closing of the meeting including: deadlines for further queries and clarifications from the project coordinator; procedures for report writing and submission.

Venue

Euroforum building - 10, rue Robert Stumper - L-2557 Luxembourg

Room 4152

Tel. 00352-4301-33048

Participants

Maurizio LUNGHI, European Commission.

? Derek LAW, reviewer.

? Antonella FRESA, reviewer.

E-Culture Net Consortium:

? Nadezhda Brakker

? Frederic Andres

? Benedetto Benedetti

? Arturo Colorado

? Jose Lozano

? Antonella Guidazzoli

? Suzanne Keene

? Manfred Thaller

? Alexander Bielowski

? Valerie Moreau

Maurizio LUNGHI
