

ECP 2008 DILI 538013 MIMO

MIMO

Final Evaluation Report

Deliverable number	<i>D5.6</i>
Dissemination level	<i>Public</i>
Delivery date	<i>27 September 2011</i>
Status	<i>Final</i>
Author(s)	<i>Ignace De Keyser (RMCA) Norman Rodger (UEDIN)</i>



eContentplus

This project is funded under the *eContentplus* programme¹,
a multiannual Community programme to make digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and exploitable.

¹ OJ L 79, 24.3.2005, p. 1.

Introduction

As anticipated in the DoW, performance measurement and evaluation was central to the success of the MIMO project. Without this the project would not have achieved its objectives. Many of the tasks within the project were based around meeting interdependent targets, so within the structure of the work packages, ongoing performance measurement was necessary to move through the agreed schedule. In some areas measuring performance was based on achieving quantity, for example in harvesting the agreed numbers of digital images on time, while in others it was either about achieving functionality or technical standards.

Evaluation was the focus of Work Package 5, led by RMCA, and the aim was to ensure that the project developed in accordance with the needs of the target users, the consortium members and EUROPEANA. Through systematic monitoring, carried out at regular intervals over the life of the project, assessment and evaluation shaped the direction of the work to ensure that all those needs were met.

Within WP 5 there were six deliverables, with this report being the final one. The first five focussed on work as outlined in The DoW but in the synopsis of WP5 work in that document this did not cover the evaluation work being done as integral task of each of the other five work packages. This report offers a summary of the WP5 deliverables and combines those with a synopsis of the evaluation work that was carried out on other parts of the project.

It should be noted that due to the retirement of Ignace de Keyser of RMCA, there was some break in the continuity for WP5, as no one else in that organisation picked up the role of WP5 leader. The final two deliverables were completed by Norman Rodger, Project Manager.

Work Package 5 Deliverables

Prior to the completion of this report, there were five deliverables assigned to Work Package 5, each of which was based around a specific task. These were as follows:

D5.1 Assessment of Existing Digital Content

In the pre-proposal development stages of MIMO each partner had carried out an initial assessment of the contents of their collection and, more specifically, those instruments in need of digitisation, but as a more accurate figure was required in order to establish workflows once the project was underway, a further assessment was carried out in months 0-1 of the project.

This led to the following conclusions:

1. Although figures about digital photos (45,401) and available metadata (38,670) were confirmed after this new survey, all members of the consortium still recognise that definite figures could not be given at the beginning of the digitisation process, as new information would emerge during the project. Because of variances between catalogue records and actual items (e.g. missing items, duplicates, missing records etc.) the numbers given at this stage were still effectively an estimate and it would not be until the digitisation process was complete that we would have definitive information on the size of the member's collections, as measured in terms of individual objects. RMCA and SPK foresaw an additional input of photos that were relevant for the documentation of collection items. It should be noted that 18.580 musical instruments were of non-European origin, i.e. 41%.
2. Audio files (1786) were relatively limited in number.
3. Video clips (307) were marginal but, on the basis of the current survey, at least two ethnomusicological collections (SPK and RMCA) anticipated that they would eventually supply additional material.
4. Existing digital born images are available in a TIFF non compressed format with four partners: GNM / AF / CM (partly: colour photos) / SMS (partly: scans of colour prints). Resolutions varied.
5. Audio files were available in WAV and mp3 formats.

Conclusions as far as the surveys / tests are concerned:

6. In order to organise user surveys of the digital content, the level for such surveys had to be defined, whether it be at Europeana, MIMO or on-line presentations at local level – in the partners' institutions themselves.
7. In order to define the most efficient way to do so and to streamline the efforts, additional contacts/meetings were needed between WP5 and WP6 members in the months 3 to 9.
8. WP5 remained responsible for conducting and evaluating these surveys and the tests needed for M12.

Postscript to D5.1

In the context of the digitisation work undertaken by the partner museums it emerged that, in most cases, even the second assessment was not 100% accurate, as additional instruments were discovered and others, which were listed in museum inventories, were no longer in the collections. Many of the latter group, particularly in Leipzig (ULEI) were instruments that went missing during the Second World War, either destroyed or stolen. While this did have some impact on the number of

instruments available for digitisation, the positive aspect was that by the end of the project all partners had a far more accurate and up to date record of their collections.

D5.2 Further Amendments to Pilot Content and the Test Site Revised

By the start of Year 2 of the project it had become clear that the way in which the project had developed was not ideally matched with the proposed task list for WP5, as outlined in the DoW and this resulted in some confusion about how to approach evaluation.

Task 5.2 for WP5 was to invite all user focus groups to take part in an online survey, within one month of the first content being displayed online (M12), using the project's website, displaying a test version of the content that would eventually be sourced via EUROPEANA. This was to focus on usability and content. However, as reported to the European Commission at the mid project review, there was some confusion about what was to be tested as the WP5 leader had assumed that the website referred to in the DoW task description was to have been the project website when, in fact it should have been the site which we now refer to as MIMO-DB. This resulted in some internal debate and a delay in developing and conducting a relevant survey. By the time the survey was conducted, it is now questionable whether it was of much practical value – certainly in terms of shaping the form of MIMO-DB – but it did at least provide us with not only some user feedback and also meant that staff within the partner museums (both those conducting and taking part in the survey) had a greater understanding of the prototype version of MIMO-DB and how it worked. A summary of the deliverable follows:

Interview Version of MIMO's Online Survey

An Interview Version of MIMO's online survey questionnaire was made by WP5 in order to test the MIMO-DB with the URL <http://194.250.19.151/MIMO/inofodc>.^{*} This interface contained searchable metadata harvested from two museums (CM and GNM) and links between the harvested records and the WP3 vocabulary.

Interviews were carried out between November 19th and December 18th, 2010 among staff members or external referents to the institutions linked with the MIMO consortium members. 43 respondents were interviewed.

For full results see Deliverable 5.2

^{*} - *N.B. link is no longer live*

D5.3 Evaluation of Subject Focused Information

As reported later in this document, there were some tensions between the understanding of the WP5 leader and the project management over the focus of the WP5 deliverables. By the end of Year 1 it was becoming increasingly apparent that the wording of the WP5 section of the DoW did not accurately reflect the work that was required of this group. A lengthy meeting between the leader of WP5 and the Project Management Team (*see below - Stockholm 1:1 Meetings*) resulted in a solution being reached and changes to the programme being made.

D5.3 covered the internal evaluation of the work of WP 1, 2 and 3.

The subject focused information was:

- Digitisation
- Harvesting

- Classification and Dictionaries

This report was drawn from ongoing internal assessment of project tasks and especially the evaluation elements of the Work Package meetings of WPs 1, 2 and 3 held in Tervuren, Belgium in January 2011.

For full results see Deliverable 5.3

D5.4 - Further Amendments to Pilot Content and the Test Site Revised

The evaluation strategy as described in the Description of Work was largely focussed on the usability and content of the material being delivered by MIMO to Europeana. From the outset we were aware that no content would be live on the Europeana site until towards the end of the project's lifetime and consequently any evaluation of online content could not be undertaken on that interface. At the start of the project we did explore the possibility of creating a mock up of the Europeana site for evaluation purposes but it soon became apparent that setting up something with sufficient functionality for complex evaluation was going to prove too time consuming. As an alternative, we developed an approach using access to the MIMO-DB interface. As a focus for public evaluation, however, the latter was not ideal, for the reasons outlined below.

Initial surveys were undertaken at the end of 2010 and at the WP5 meeting in Tervuren in January, 2011 it was agreed that all project partners should continue to carry out interview based surveys building on the work undertaken so far and with specific focus on the usability and relevance on the digital content. As before, these surveys were undertaken using guest access to MIMO-DB.

In addition a second, more general survey was undertaken online using SurveyMonkey.

While the first survey's participants were identified by staff at each partner museum, the online survey was promoted through both email invitation, via the MIMO mailing list, and open access via the MIMO Facebook page. In so doing, it was hoped that not only would this survey be carried out by a greater number of people but also a wider user base as, inevitably, those participants selected by museums were more likely to have some degree of expertise in the field.

The first results of both surveys were presented to the MIMO WP6 meeting in London (HML) on 2nd March 2011. The full report is included in D5.5. While both surveys showed a high percentage of positive answers and produced some minor amendments to our content (see following report), there were a number of concerns.

In relation to the Interview Surveys, there were only 40 respondents to the survey and it was felt that that was not an adequate sample. Moreover, of those 40, the greater number were from the musical instrument community and it was intended that the target should have been a more general audience rather than only "experts" being involved.

As indicated above, it had been hoped that the online survey might have been more successful in this respect but here too it became apparent that a significant number of the respondents came from a musical background. In order to reach a more general audience it was agreed that we should no longer pursue this line of enquiry and instead develop an alternative approach.

Given that the interface being used for the evaluation bears no relation to the Europeana site, i.e. the only place in which MIMO content will be publicly visible, it was also agreed that it made more sense to wait until material was live on Europeana before undertaking a wider evaluation, as this would be of more relevance to the general public. It was also noted, however, that in terms of making changes to content in response to feedback or revising the test site, an evaluation of MIMO material on Europeana would serve little practical purpose, as by then it would be too late to make any significant changes to our approach.

As it turned out, the changes made by Europeana, moving from ESE to EDM, meant that no content from MIMO went live in the lifetime of the project, meaning that we were unable to carry out any evaluation of our material in the Europeana website. *It should be noted that our material was ready to be harvested on time and that the delay was caused by internal work at Europeana.*

After some discussion it was therefore agreed that we should rethink our evaluation strategy as laid out in the DoW. This would have an impact on the type of evaluation undertaken in the final months of the project and, consequently the focus of the remaining deliverables from this Work Package.

The following points were therefore agreed:

- In terms of online content, a full evaluation of MIMO would not be possible until the final stages of the project when content was live on Europeana and users could actually look at the site. It was also agreed that further discussion would be required to develop a strategy that ensured more general public input to any more surveys.
- It was noted however, that any such survey would be as much about the way in which Europeana functions as of the content of the MIMO aggregator.
- D5.5, due on 24.06.11, would not be possible to complete under the title of the report given in the DoW - "Final amendments to Pilot Content in Response to Feedback and the Test Site Revised." It was decided that this would have to be completely re-focussed and, consequently, the title was changed to **"Internal Evaluation of Work Package Output."** An email requesting permission to make this change was sent to the Commission on 30th May, 2011, with a revised submission date of 1st July. No confirmation was received until 29th June, resulting in a late completion and submission of this deliverable.

Although this represented a shift away from the approach outlined in the DoW it was recognised as a positive move and one which arose from ongoing internal evaluation through discussion at project meetings.

Ongoing Evaluation

Internally, most evaluation work was undertaken, not by WP5, but by each of the other work packages, as they undertook ongoing internal assessment in order to ensure that their work met the targets and standards outlined in the DoW. This was then reviewed within the Work Package and Project Steering Group Meetings throughout the life of the project

A failing of Work Package 5 was not to integrate this information into its written reports and rather to resolutely adhere to the wording of the Description of Work for the direction and content of its deliverables. Within the partnership, one of the criticisms levelled at WP5 was that it did not interact sufficiently with the whole group in carrying out its work outside of the scheduled formal meetings, resulting in a lack of clarity about how to approach evaluation. This is perhaps reflected in the quality of the output from that WP.

That said, it was strength of the project that so much evaluation work was carried and out and without it we most certainly would not have progressed in the manner we did. All meetings worked to very tight agendas, with critical discussions setting clear targets for the next working period and progress on this activity closely monitored at the following meeting. The consensus amount the partners was that the Management Team maintained very strict control of the project (some felt too strict) but that this proved beneficial to the day to day running of the operation. By way of evidence, minutes from all PSG Meetings will be attached as an appendix to the project's Final Report.

Mid Project Evaluation

The biggest piece of evaluation work undertaken during the project was the internal review undertaken by the Project Steering Group (PSG) at their meeting in Stockholm in October, 2010, the half way point in the project.

This was carried out in two parts: a review with the whole group, followed by 1:1 sessions between the UEDIN Project Management Team and each partner.

The aim of the group session was to review the progress of the project at the end of Year 1 and discuss what had changes had to be made in Year 2 in order to achieve all targets.

The process was to assess:

- what we had done so far
- what we still had to do
- look at the DoW – are there things we said we would do but haven't/can't/won't? - if so why/what would we do instead?

The aim of the 1:1 sessions was to assess where each partner was in relation to achieving the project's objectives, to discuss any difficulties or concerns that they might have had and to identify solutions to potential problems. It was also seen as an opportunity for the partner to express any concerns they had about the way that the project was being managed.

PSG Session

The starting point for the group session was a discussion on the outcome of the **EC Mid-Project Review**, held in Luxembourg, in September 2010. While were generally satisfied with the outcome of the review, the consensus was that we could not ignore the criticisms, however minor, and must not become complacent for the remainder of the project.

In the formal feedback from that review there were 3 main points that we needed to address:

“1. That careful attention is paid to the institutions’ abilities and success in creating harvestable metadata repositories, to ensure that the necessary data is available in practice.”

The focus here was therefore i) to discuss how we could stay on track in Year 2 in order to meet targets and ii) to ensure that each partner put mechanisms in place to ensure that this would happen.

2. That the user group base is extended in a planned way to include all necessary user groups defined in the DoW and that the correspondence of the project results to their needs is assessed.

3. That the dissemination activities, especially those directed to the general public, are more widely realised in terms of partner areas (at the moment strong performance in this respect only in Germany).

Both of the above points had been noted at the last 2 sets of meetings – Brussels and Berlin – and we were very aware that by this point these should have been resolved.

It was agreed that all partners had to increase their output for year two, particularly in relation to dissemination, and continue to support all other WP leaders.

In addition, the reviewers also highlighted the following areas: -

- *The digitisation target, 25,000 items, was not reached completely (actual amount 21,135 items) but this minor gap was explained in an acceptable manner and it was demonstrated that final targets could be reached within the lifetime of the project.*
- *Difficulties in using Skype in individual institutions... might be a good issue to resolve in the remaining project time.*
- *Quality of meeting minutes tend to vary from meeting to meeting, and coherence would benefit from an even more structured approach.*

Description of Work Review

In addressing how we resolve the above issues, we reviewed the **DoW** to identify areas where we were weak or which we had not yet tackled.

It should be noted that, at all PSG meetings, the Project Management Team consistently stated that all partners needed to keep referring to the DoW throughout the project to ensure that we were doing not just what we said we would do, but when we did it. Although we were largely on track, there were a number of areas where more progress could have been made.

We elected to pick up some of these in the 1:1 sessions with each partner, e.g. where issues were specific to them, but there are also some areas that relate to everyone.

The PSG worked through the DoW as it was printed, so in the course of the session there–were some areas of overlap or duplication.

Page 5 - Expected Results

“This resource will be accessible beyond the life of the project and new content will continue to be added, not only within the existing project partnership but for other museums wishing to contribute to it.”

There was some concern that although the process of sustainability was looked at from the first meeting, progress had slipped slightly. At the time of the meeting, the project still only had a draft of the Level 1 Agreement and there were only 2 working meetings to progress beyond this. Concern was expressed that if were to leave this work until PSG meetings there will not be enough time to develop expanded agreements. As a result of this discussion it was agreed that all partners have to work on

this between meetings, under the direction of WP6, with additional meetings set up as required by a Sustainability sub group.

“Evaluation and Assessment (WP5) will be carried out at regular intervals over the life of the project, to shape the direction of the project to ensure that all needs are met.”

Some concern was expressed about the fact that the leader of WP5 was not engaging with other partners in order to fully evaluate the project. This would be followed up in detail with the individual in question during the 1:1 session but in general the view was that he needed to engage more and make more demands of from other partners.

It was agreed that output from WP5 and WP6 had to increase dramatically before the end of the project. More focussed discussion with regards to how to shape the rest of this project was required and this had to be directed from the leaders of both WP5 and WP6.

As a start to this process and in recognition of the importance of these areas of work, the agenda of the meeting was changed to accommodate two brainstorm sessions for each of these work packages.

P16

Section 5.2: Target users.

These are the groups that we said we would reach – the review asked if we were doing this successfully.

- EDUCATION (teachers, university teachers, students teachers, pupils, students in general)
- COMMUNITIES (musicians, ensembles, composers, instrumentalists)
- JOURNALISTS AND EDITORS (broadcasting, television etc., music industry)
- ACADEMIC RESEARCHERS
- AMATEURS, MUSIC LOVERS
- INSTRUMENT PROFESSIONALS (collectors, museums, curators, dealers, insurance)
- INSTRUMENT MAKERS AND INSTRUMENT CONSERVATORS

It was noted that a qualitative or quantitative review of how we are reaching these people was required. At that stage the only data available related to website usage, but it was recognised that a lot more detail was required as it was important to know not only how many people were visiting the website but what was their purpose. It was also noted that the project website was not a reflection of our output, it was only an interface reflecting progress of the project. Any evaluation of impact had to include **all** of the data in the project.

It was agreed that WP6 had to ask for a lot more input from the other partners in relation to impact e.g. details on audience size at presentations, readership of printed articles, etc.

Although it was reported that so far 337 e-mail addresses and definition of users had been obtained. The view from the management team was that this was not nearly enough and efforts had to be stepped up to expose more people to the data.

It was agreed that WP6 should develop a work plan, including set dates and deadlines to encourage more people to look at the website and use the data. Each country is to have a meeting to discuss this.

Page 19 Performance measurement and evaluation.

“As part of the project development each WP will establish a performance monitoring and evaluation strategy at its initial meeting and will use this as a guideline throughout the life of the project. “

Although no formal strategies had been set up at the start of the project, it was suggested that as all the WP meetings were the main forum for evaluation, then this process might be seen to fulfil this function, although it was questioned whether this was enough. It was agreed that as each WP leader was responsible for this, they should focus on how to cover this for the rest of the project.

“Each member of the consortium will be responsible for the distribution of promotional materials and information within their museum and its networks of contacts and will also be asked to track trends in response to this material. “

Action in this area was seen as critical. It was an area that all partners needed to review but it was also fair to say that WP6 needed to take a much more active role in ensuring that this happened, ensuring that distribution of material, attendance at events, etc. was tracked and recorded. It was again noted that a lot of work had been completed in Germany, but very little from elsewhere.

All partners were asked to improve the quality of information that was sent back to WP6, so that they could build up an overall picture of dissemination activity

It was noted that clarity was missing with respect to the communication strategy for this WP; some partners felt that they were providing data but did not feel involved with the process or outcome. WP6 was asked to develop a clear set of guidelines on what was required from each partner in order to complete this.

Pages 50-51

Dissemination and Awareness

“Dissemination activities will be coordinated by the work package leader (SPK) supported by SMS-MM but work will be carried out by all MIMO partners. Each institution will be responsible for the activities in their own country so that MIMO can guarantee an intensive coverage in at least nine countries and eight languages (UK, DE, BE, IT, FR, SE, AT, SI, DK). Further activities in other European countries... for example, the consortium has good connections to Switzerland, Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary and Romania.

To ensure maximum impact, MIMO will enact a number of targeted activities in a large number of European countries. These activities will be aimed at a broad public, with the particular goal of stimulating the use of MIMO in the educational sector and among musicians, composers, concert-goers and musical amateurs.”

It was noted that it was essential that WP6 develop a clear strategy to achieve this. It was felt that it would be useful to have some standards for WP5 and 6 to work towards and that could be achieved. At present, some partners felt that all they could do was to give out leaflets with no real result.

It was again noted the strategy for WP5 and WP6 must be defined. Once the strategy was in place, all other partners would then have something to work towards, and could consequently achieve more. It would also be possible to identify if anyone was falling behind for these WP's.

As a result of these discussions it was agreed that an additional WP5/6 meeting be arranged. This would take place in Berlin in December.

Meetings

The programme of meetings for the rest of the project was also reviewed to ensure that we would maximise their value in order to achieve our goals.

- **Tervuren:** an additional day was added on the 11th January, giving us three working days.
- **London:** WP3, an additional day was be added
- **Florence:** an extra day to be added.
- **Edinburgh:** it was agreed that these dates remain as planned.

It was also noted that we needed to maximise the working time by arranging sub group sessions around the main sessions, so WP leaders were asked that if they need to discuss issues with other partners that they should contact them in advance to arrange a suitable time to meet up.

1:1 Meetings

Over the course of the three days that the MIMO partners were in Stockholm a programme of meetings was set up around the full programme so that the UEDIN Management Team could discuss individual partners' progress and any issues of concern. Where it was not possible to meet face to face in Stockholm, meetings were held via Skype shortly afterwards.

A summary of these meetings follows.

GNM – Stockholm, 29 November 2011

The purpose of the meeting was to focus on the work of GNM as a partner in the MIMO project and its capacity as leader of WP1.

GNM

The UEDIN Management Team were very pleased with the input from GNM since the outset of the project. All deliverables and reports are on time or ahead of schedule.

The programme of work at GNM is on schedule and the only change has been some minor modifications to the budget.

WP1

GNM expressed some concerns over the images from RMCA, with 500 flutes not been photographed according to the MIMO standard. This was reported to the WP1 meeting. They need to ensure that controls are in place during photo sessions.

He also expressed some concerns about SPK's ability to deliver content on time, due to the delay in recruitment and the additional delays caused by building work.

He also commented on the fact that the ULEI had had to reassess the quality of their existing digital content and as a result have decided to re-photograph all their instruments.

Finally he commented on the fact that he has been working closely with the team at CM.

ULEI – Stockholm, 28th October 2010

The aim of the meeting was to undertake a review of the work done by ULEI as a project partner.

ULEI

ULEI confirmed that this is the third European project they have been involved with, and the organisation for MIMO has been very good; the Edinburgh team have certain strengths that have not been present in any of the previous projects. They also have had good support from the team at CM in Paris and GNM in Nürnberg. They have not experienced any problems with any of the other partners so far.

From their point of view a lot has been learnt during the process of the project and they think that Leipzig is now in a good position to complete on time. Enormous progress has been made within the museum. Their database was installed on the 27th October and the harvesting is planned for November. Another challenge is all the photos, transferring from analogue to digital. ULEI are on schedule to complete all the photography, but some of the photos that will be used are old, so they are

not quite up to the MIMO standard. The output will be complete but the quality will be variable. UEDIN confirmed that this was acceptable as some other partners were in a similar situation. Post project, ULEI will put an ongoing digitisation programme in place whereby the old photos will be replaced by new images, taken to MIMO standard.

ULEI now have a proper inventory system for the first time, including a record of which instruments are photographed and where they are. Methods for harvesting are in place, and once this has started they will be able to confirm if they are experiencing any problems.

The ULEI team are all aware of the tasks and what the deadlines are, and will be able to review this if there are any ongoing problems. ULEI have regular internal meetings to discuss MIMO and the progress that is being made. ULEI realise that MIMO is of great importance for the whole museum, so would like to see it completed successfully, and would be able to make internal working adjustments to changing work demands.

Dissemination

UEDIN reiterated the situation with respect to WP6 (as outlined in the PSG meetings) and that this is now an important issue for all of the project partners. Everyone must now understand that this WP has a big impact at the end of the project, and that we cannot fall at the last hurdle, so it will require a lot of work in the next few weeks. ULEI feel that they have done everything they could to help, but we will now report any dissemination activity to UEDIN as well as SPK, so that everyone is aware of the progress that is being made. They feel that previous submissions to WP6 have not been detailed enough, and every opportunity will now be recorded - perhaps been too reserved in the past and now realise that more information is required for this WP. ULEI confirmed that they would be able to take photos of their presentations, lectures and seminars etc. so that these can be used on the Facebook page.

Budget

ULEI confirmed that there are some concerns with their budget, but these are all internal within the university, and not to do with the project. They still have money to spend, but the budget was formalised over two years ago so there have been some changes where the money goes.

There was a discussion about the possible use of subcontractors, which UEDIN confirmed would mean that they would lose part of their overheads. ULEI to look into this possibility and review the funding implications.

Communication

ULEI have found the overall communication good, but have been a little unclear of the demands from WP6 so far. They would like to see more pressure and leadership from this WP, so that they know where to go with it, and how to make progress. UEDIN confirmed that they were aware of this and hoped that the situation would improve over the next few weeks.

RMCA – Stockholm, 29 November 2011

The aim of the meeting was to undertake a review of the work done by RMCA as a project partner and in its role as leader of WP5.

RMCA

RMCA began by reporting that the current quality of data from the museum was poor – “mediocre to bad.” They have had problems with a member of staff whose output has been especially slow. There

have also been some issues with the photography, with around 500 photographs of flutes not taken to the MIMO standard. This has been reported to WP1. RMCA suggested that, as an alternative, black and white photos of these instruments be scanned and substituted for the incorrectly shot images. This was overruled by UEDIN (in line with GNM's advice at the WP1 meeting) and it was agreed that the new photos should be used for now. If there is time and budget available, the incorrect ones can be re-photographed to the correct standard later in the project or at some time in the future. There is also some concern over the ability to build the repository as there are internal difficulties within the museum. Moreover, plans are currently to build a static repository, which is not ideal, and UEDIN suggested that RMCA should instead work on creating a dynamic repository as this will enable automatic updates to MIMO-DB, which will not only be more effective but will significantly reduce workload on post project uploads. It was also suggested that they seek technical support from staff at nearby MIM-BE.

WP5

It was agreed that activity on WP5 has to significantly step up.

UEDIN outlined their concerns and voiced those of other members of the consortium, in relation to evaluation and assessment. Much of the discussion focussed on the fact that RMCA was taking on too much responsibility for this work without involving other members of the consortium or making use of external sources, such as Europeana and other European projects. This needs to change and there needs to be a much more proactive approach from WP5 in developing and producing the deliverables in this area.

The work on WP5 is well behind schedule and the level and quality of information gathered so far is insufficient for the preparation of the two deliverables (D5.2 and D5.3) due to be submitted in December. UEDIN proposed that we need to radically overhaul the existing workplan and devise a new strategy. This will need to be reported to and approved by the European Commission no later than Friday 12th November.

It was agreed that we develop a new plan which covers the remaining ten months of the project. This should be broken down into 3 stages:

1. The period from now until the meetings in Tervuren, in January 2011.
2. The following three months.
3. The final three months.

The programme for Period 1 needs to be very detailed and offer a clear strategy, with dates and deadlines for all partners to follow. It was proposed that this follows the outline discussed in the breakout session at the previous day's PSG meeting.

RMCA has to devise a short practical test to evaluate the content currently on MIMO-DB. This should include clear guidelines, with screen shots, on how to navigate and use the system – this should be developed in close consultation with CM. A sub group of 5 partners will then be asked to identify 4 members of staff who will carry out the test, thus giving us a user group of 20 people for the initial test. To enable this, CM will need to create a “read only” version of MIMO-DB, so that no data can be altered during the test. RMCA to contact CM by the end of w/b 1st November to request that this be done.

Having conducted the test, the results will then be analysed, then discussed with CM so that modifications can be made as required. The test itself will also be reviewed and modified accordingly and a follow up will then be undertaken by all partners, this time identifying 5 people, thus giving us a further 55 results.

This needs to have been implemented by the end of the year so that results can be analysed in time for reporting to the Tervuren meetings in January.

An outline plan for Period 2 also needs to be developed at this time, with an expanded, detailed programme presented to the Tervuren meetings in January. This work should represent a significant step up in the activity of period 1 and needs to be completed by the end of April so that results can be analysed in time for presentation at the meetings in Florence in May.

A less detailed, indicative programme for stage 3 should also be prepared at this stage and the final version being ready by the time of the PSG meeting in Florence.

It was also proposed that as part of the internal evaluation strategy, WP5 looks at establishing a monitoring system, to ensure that we keep track of the internal mechanisms of each partner for monitoring progress on repository development, as stated in the Luxembourg review.

AF/UF – 9th November 2010 (Skype)

The aim of the meeting was to undertake a review of the work done by AF/UF as a project partner during year one.

Overview

It was confirmed that AF/UF are on schedule and that everything went to plan with regards to the photography. It is expected that all items will be digitised by February. It was further reported that the testing phase of the database, with regards to harvesting at AF, has just been completed and it is expected that this will be installed by the end of November. Mapping the records has also begun (it has been outsourced) and some test records have already been sent to CM. It was reported that this initial phase was successful, and that further records would be sent in the LIDO version 1.0 soon. It is expected that the first phase of harvesting will be tested in early December.

All digitised images are still to be transferred into the database, and that this will have to be done by hand, not automatically. This should be completed by early to mid February. The translation of names for the instruments has begun, and it is not expected that this would take very long. It was confirmed that CM are happy with the expected completion date for this work.

AF/UF acknowledged that they were inexperienced with regards to European wide projects and that more money should have been requested initially. There has been additional difficulty with regards to the differences between AF and UF funding.

WP Meetings/PSG Meetings

UEDIN noted that all partners are being reminded of the importance to attend all WP meetings and the remaining PSG meetings, as one or two sessions had been missed. It was reported that the intention

is to change the structure of the remaining meetings, with shorter reports from some of the WPs and more of a focus on the WPs that are behind schedule.

Project Management

AF/UF reported that the management of the project had been good, but it would have helped to have a clearer overview of the project from the outset. AF/UF struggled slightly with the technical aspects of the project, but have learnt a lot by being a partner. UEDIN noted that most of the partners were inexperienced in one aspect or another, but that the support from all project partners has led to everyone learning together.

WP6

AF/UF feel that WP6 is currently the weak point of the project, but acknowledge that, internally, this area has not been their main priority, so feel that more demands should have been made on them. UEDIN noted that the issues with WP5 and 6 have now been recognised, and that all partners are expected to support these WP leaders over the remaining period of the project. It was noted that a complete change of approach for each of these WPs may be required in order to comply with the DoW.

UEDIN reported that the intention is to develop a strategy for WP5 and 6 at the Berlin meeting in December, with the development of a press pack and international strategy.

New Project Partners

AF/UF reminded everyone of the intention, expressed at the PSG meeting in Nürnberg, to include the data of the collection of the Accademia di S.Cecilia (about 100 records) alongside that of AF. This data is included in a separate database but has an identical structure of the one developed for AF. They were asked to check with CM that this additional data can be handled successfully, and what, if any, implications this may have on the Level 1 Sustainability Agreement.

CM – Stockholm, 27th November 2010

The aim of the meeting was to undertake a review of the work done by CM as a project partner and in its role as leader of WP2.

Overview

UEDIN began by confirming that there were no problems with CM and that they recognise that CM was responsible for the infrastructure of the project, so their input has been critical from the start. CM explained that they recognise the weak points of the harvesting process but think it should get better, and expect to have everything finished by December/January. They are still expecting every partner to deliver on time but there is a back up plan if this isn't possible, which can be discussed later, should the need arise. Florence were a long way behind but have now caught up. Their biggest concern at present is SMS-MM, as they haven't started the process yet. They understand that their database has been "cleaned" but that no mapping or harvesting has been done yet. SMS-MM will be employing someone to do this or getting a subcontractor, as they are aware they are behind and can see the scale of the problem. CM is expecting to re-assess the situation again in Dec/Jan and make alternative plans then if SMS-MM is still behind. CM confirmed that they were expecting to be asked for help by other partners and have made provision for this.

WP3

CM explained that they were working much more on WP3 than was originally expected, and that they have also been helping HML with a lot of their technical issues. CM feel that they have done all they can at the moment, but are happy to be of further assistance for WP3/HML if required. They are confident that the classification is good, but there are still some concerns about the technical aspects,

which could now be quite difficult to resolve. UEDIN acknowledged that they take responsibility for this and will make HML aware that they only arrived for WP3 meeting in Stockholm and therefore will have missed some of the other important WP discussions.

WP5

CM does not feel the WP5 questionnaire has the right *perspective*, but are unsure how much they can help with this. They have tried to contact RMCA about this, but have not received any correspondence. Although CM are happy to help, they are not sure if they should keep on offering, when RMCA should be leading on this. It is agreed that WP5 needs urgent attention in order to bring it into line with the other WPs. CM are concerned that RMCA has not progressed since the start of the project and does not have any awareness of the ongoing impact that this will have on the rest of the project and its future sustainability.

It is noted that there is now a need to put steps in place to make sure that RMCA can get to the end of the project successfully. It would be a good opportunity to develop an awareness of the impact of the project and its sustainability and offer this as an example of “best practice” to pass on to the commission for other project leaders to follow. UEDIN explained that there is a lot of expertise within the MIMO team to draw on, but RMCA has so far failed to contact any of the associate partners and no meetings have been called for WP5, therefore there is no direct support network. It is confirmed that this is one of the most pressing issues and we must acknowledge we are behind on this WP, and all work together bring it in to line as soon as possible.

It is noted by CM that there have been no reported problems with RMCA regarding their harvesting, but no results have been received yet.

WP6

It is noted that there are also problems with WP6, and that UEDIN have been doing a lot of supporting work for this WP. It is possible that this is due to their internal management structure and the lack of internal support.

CM requested that UEDIN confirm in the Management Report that WP5 and WP6 are behind and that they both now need attention and support from all the partners.

Other comments

It is noted that MIMO is seen as an important and well respected successful project in France and everyone wants to make the most of this and not let anything slip in the second year. Europeana see MIMO as a specific within a subject area but are keen to use it as an example for everyone else to see how projects can work successfully. There is scope to use the project structure more widely within Europeana – i.e. that it can be modelled and re-used. UEDIN reported that the Commission’s reaction at the most recent review was positive, and that everyone needs to work hard to make sure that this is maintained in year two.

CM reported that they are using MIMO as a tool to inform colleagues about their success with Europeana and that it gives a very positive picture of their role as a national aggregator. They would like to have more discussions with Europeana about their future prospects and its ongoing sustainability issues.

CM considers that UEDIN are doing a good job managing the project and that they are looking forward to completing the work on time at the end of year two.

MIM-BE – Stockholm, 29 November 2011

The purpose of the meeting was to focus on the work of MIM-BE in the MIMO project.

MIM-BE began by discussing WP3, pointing out that they had done a lot of work in this area, and much more than anticipated at the outset.

They also stressed that, in general, the work of WP3 has perhaps been underplayed when we talk of the successes of the MIMO project, as the resources produced by that group are of great importance for the study of musical instruments. We need to make better use of these resources in our dissemination activities, particularly amongst specialists. They also suggested that we should be looking towards publishing these results to pick up on their level of importance. The input of Maarten Quanten has been a very significant addition to the classification

In relation to WP1, they reported that MIM had undertaken a review of all their existing photographs and had decided to re-photograph their entire collection.

In general, MIM-BE feel they have done the least work on WP5 and WP6 but this is because a) they have been so busy in other areas and b) that WP4 should perhaps do more to help the partnership as a whole to help out both those work packages.

UEDIN feel that MIM-BE have contributed very well to the project so far with all reports coming in on or ahead of schedule.

HML - 9th November 2010 (Skype)

The aim of the meeting was to undertake a review of the work done by HML as a project partner and in its role as leader of WP3.

Overview

UEDIN began by confirming that there were no real issues with HML or with WP3. UEDIN reported that WP3 has progressed well, has produced a large volume of work and has received positive feedback. It was felt that this WP could be used for promotional work.

HML reported that the dictionary/thesaurus had been sent to the 2000 members of IAML and this would count for WP6 records. It was further reported that the friends of HML will also receive a newsletter later in November detailing the activities of the MIMO project. HML also reported that there should be a further article in the Galpin Society publication, due out in February 2010 – HML are to confirm readership of the Galpin Society publication. It was noted that the dissemination and work for WP6 by HML would be via publications rather than any other method. HML are to report all these activities to WP6 and include copy of article/publication.

WP3

UEDIN reported that there was a slight concern with regards to HML's attendance at meetings, as one or two sessions had been missed. At this stage in the project it was important for everyone to attend all WP meetings to understand what progress is being made. All partners must also attend the review meeting in November 2011. UEDIN further reported that CM have experienced some technical issues with WP3, and that they have done more work than expected which has had a knock on effect on their work. HML are to contact CM directly regarding the issues with WP3 and to resolve them as soon as possible.

WP6 in the UK

A strategy for dissemination in the UK was discussed, and it was proposed that a press conference is held in London in March. This will coincide with the start/end of an exhibition of V&A items in HML. HML to send brief description of the exhibition to UEDIN to check that there would be no potential conflicts with regards to hosting a joint press conference.

It was reported that the joint WP5/6 meeting in Berlin would hopefully produce a suitable press pack, and that further discussions could take place in Tervuren prior to the meeting in London. The intention would be to get the press and media offices at HML and UEDIN to collaborate. HML and UEDIN are to schedule a meeting in Tervuren to discuss UK dissemination further. UEDIN to consult with SPK about targeting international press releases at the WP5/6 meeting.

It was noted that all partners are now being asked to focus their efforts on WP5 and 6 and to ensure their continued support for the WP leaders. HML to write more articles for publication, and to copy UEDIN into the correspondence with SPK confirming this.

Budget/Staffing

HML reported that there may be some issues with regards to adding the Hornbostel Sachs name and number, and that this could not be done automatically or by computer, but would instead involve staff time (approx. 1-2 months). If any recruitment is required, this is to be done as soon as possible, due to the time constraints of the project. HML to contact CM urgently regarding this issue, as it may be the same as the problem noted previously.

Final Comments

HML reported that there has been some variability with regards to the minutes from the meetings and the WP3 minutes from Stockholm have not yet been circulated. It was acknowledged that this has been an issue over the summer due to the lack of admin support at UEDIN, but it is hoped that this is now resolved. Changing the strategy for the WP meetings and agendas was discussed and UEDIN will consider a revised schedule for the meetings in Tervuren where the focus will be on the WPs that are behind.

SPK/WP6 – Stockholm, 28th November 2010

The aim of the meeting was to undertake a review of the work done by SPK as a project partner and in its role as leader of WP6.

SPK

It is noted that there are some known issues with SPK and that some recommendations will be made. Specifically there are concerns with regards to the timing of the digitisation. SPK acknowledged that there have been problems; the start of the project was delayed by conclusion of the paperwork with the European Commission and the release of the funding. SPK further reported that further issues have been caused by construction in the museum, which have caused a lot of dust and this has had knock on effects with the preparation of the material for photographing and digitisation.

SPK have now secured additional money from the government for the cleaning and restoration process and this started on Monday 25th October. The photography of the instruments has also started. It will be possible for SPK to negotiate again in December for more money from the government. The big items in the collection (pianos etc.) are to be photographed in a studio and this is expected to take until July.

UEDIN acknowledged that there had been unforeseen delays but the concern is now that SPK must ensure they are able to finish on time. There should be a workflow in place for this. SPK confirmed

that there is a workflow, and that they do intend to complete the project within the delayed timescale. It is noted that they will finish everything by Feb 2012, but that about 1000 photos will be late, or behind schedule. It is noted that SPK feel that the initial delay caused by the Commission (in formally approving the project) is partly responsible for their overall delay with regards to the digitisation.

UEDIN acknowledged that there was an initial delay, but that this affected everyone in the project and that all partners should now be doing what they can to make up for this, and regular reviews should be scheduled to ensure progress is being made. It was confirmed that all project partners were here to help ensure that everyone could complete on time, there is no need to suffer in isolation.

SPK noted that it may be possible to ask their staff to work full time for the next few months. However, this may have practical issues regarding work space and work flows etc.

SPK are to provide UEDIN with a report about the efforts they are going to undertake in order to complete on time and how they are to be maintained. Information will be supplied in the first week of December when they have an idea of the delay.

Harvesting

SPK reported that progress was being made with the harvesting and that they have a subcontractor working on this. Despite some concerns about the fact that he is working remotely on this task (i.e not in Berlin) SPK are satisfied that he has sufficient experience of exporting data so he knows how it works and that he is still the best person for the job.

Internal staffing issues at SPK

UEDIN expressed concern about the structure of the staff at SPK and each person's specific role within the project. For example an issue arose where it became apparent that a key member of the team had no awareness of the SPK budget. SPK reported that there are problems with bureaucracy at the parent SPK organisation as project accounts are centralised. It was further reported that the central person who deals with the budget (not employed by the project) was away for a period of time, so this contributed to the lack of awareness of the budget.

As an example, UEDIN illustrated a situation where the lack of awareness of the budget within the staff team could have resulted in the loss of over 20,000 euros, as overheads had not been included as a cost in the financial report. Had this not been picked up by UEDIN, this amount would have been lost to SPK. SPK reported that as the financial reports are centralised they did not have control, but acknowledged that they should have been checked they were within the guidelines before they were submitted to UEDIN.

It was noted that there are some concerns with regards to a particular member of the SPK team in terms of experience for this type of project. UEDIN asked whether the person concerned was being supported enough in the role as they did not appear to be coping with the responsibility. A revision of the workload was suggested in order to re-focus on other priorities within the project. As there appear to be language issues, it was agreed that the SPK will now submit all documents in German (incl. the newsletter) and that UEDIN will have them translated. The December newsletter will be a trial for this to see how this works.

WP6

It was noted that UEDIN have a few general concerns with regards to this WP. It is understood that the dissemination within Germany is good, but there is a need to make more demands on other partners to ensure they are also active in this area. It is evident that, as the lead partner for WP6, SPK are not making enough demands on the other partners and this needs to change and SPK must adopt a more direct approach. However, if there are concerns about the wording of material being sent out to partners (e.g. a request for information), UEDIN will be happy to check things before they are sent.

It was noted that SPK must be more proactive with regards to this WP.

It was recommended that SPK set up a working group for WP6, so that there can be more support and that this will enable WP6 to move forward. It was noted that the SPK should also be asking for more help from SMS-MM as they are meant to be working with SPK on WP6 – the SMS representative, as a native speaker of English, can also assist with any language issues.

Website

UEDIN reported that there are still major problems with the internal website and that a lot of additional work had to be done by the UEDIN team to cover for this before the review in Luxemburg. It is *very* important that this is addressed as soon as possible, as it is a key part of the project's communications. It was noted that there may be possible issues around the lack of expertise on the Drupal CMS system and the fact that no one else but the SPK subcontractor has full access to the internal website, as the workings of it sit on his own personal server space. It was suggested that the website could be moved to another server, or that it might be viable to disregard the original website built by him and just use the one UEDIN created. UEDIN to send information to SPK outlining the issues with the website and what the possible solutions could be and decide on the best course of action to bring this in to line with the rest of the project.

Other comments

UEDIN asked that SPK provide more regular information updates about their progress, and that they should also try and co-ordinate this for all other partners too. It was noted that this is important so as to maintain the reputation of the MIMO project within Europeana.

It was noted that WP6 also need to look again at sustainability as there are only two working meetings left to make any viable changes, and it is important that we move past Level 1 sustainability. SPK suggested that an option might be to look at commercial support for this.

Final Comments

SPK confirmed that the management of the project has been good, and that they are aware of the ongoing issues that must be attended to before the end of the project in order to complete on time.

SMS-MM – Stockholm, 28th November 2010

The aim of the meeting was to undertake a review of the work done by SMS-MM as a project partner.

Overview SMS-MM

UEDIN began by confirming that in general SMS-MM appear to be on track, their support for WP6 is all going reasonably well, but that there may be possible timing issues with the repository. He also asked whether SMS-MM could do more to help WP6 bring its work in on time.

SMS-MM understands the concerns about the repository, the initial plans had been to employ an IT specialist to complete this but they have had problems identifying the correct job description for the post. CM has now provided specific guidelines for the person they require. The full complexity of process won't be known until the job is started. SMS-MM have already asked CM for help with the recruitment process and will probably need more help once the person is in post, possibly for a day visit or via remote assistance. CM is expecting this demand on their time, but in fact everyone else has now completed the process so everyone should be able to assist with any difficulties. SMS-MM are a little concerned as their original database is in Access, which no one else has, so it might cause some unexpected delays. They also confirmed that the mapping will progress smoothly, as they have had quite a lot of experience with the data they have. The job advert should go out next week (1st

November) so should be able to get the person in post by Christmas.

UEDIN suggested they could look into the possibility of subcontracting out the role. There is no budget heading for this at present but it would be possible move the necessary amount from another heading to enable this. They would need to ensure the total cost would not be more than 20% of the budget or 100,000 euros. This might be the best option with respect to the timescales that SMS-MM is now working towards. It was agreed that SMS-MM are to look in to the possibility of using a subcontractor.

WP6

UEDIN explained there are concerns with WP6, especially around the fact that the focus of dissemination has largely been within Germany, the issues are quite clear and they must be addressed over year two of the project. SPK should be asking for more input from SMS-MM. SMS-MM should be able to offer more support where it is needed in SPK. There was some further discussion about the staffing issues at SPK and how things have changed since the start of the project, which means that SMS-MM may now be required to take more of an active role. UEDIN also recommended that SMS-MM could take suggestions from Europeana and via the *eContentplus* website, using the latter to look at past examples of projects to gain more of an idea what to do. UEDIN's concern is that we don't want to fall down in one of the areas that should be the easiest.

UEDIN reported that they had met with SPK earlier that day and the latter now understands that there is an issue with WP6 what we need to do to resolve it. SMS-MM can help with this; it is important that everything isn't left to SPK, in case there is too much for them to do at the last minute.

It was agreed that SMS-MM must take more of an active role in supporting the WP, and recognise that it might be a much more fundamental role, rather than just supportive.

Final Comments

The only comment from SMS-MM is that would be that it would be good to have more reminders, and notes about dates, deadlines and locations of important documents. UEDIN confirmed that this should all get back on track over the next few weeks.

UEDIN are aware that because there has been no admin support for the project over the summer that things have slipped a bit in relation to reminders etc. SMS-MM asked if UEDIN could send out a clear and complete list of deadlines from now until the end of the project for all partners to consult. (Information can also be found in the DoW). This was confirmed. All partners will be asked to review this and confirm they will be able to achieve the expected results on time.

Other points

There was a discussion with regards to the internal structure within SMS-MM and whether there was enough support to realise the deliverables on time. SMS-MM confirmed they should be able to get back on target. They do not have any specific strategy set out for any problems or delays, but they are aware of ongoing issues so can work on these as they arise.

Budget

SMS-MM do not have any concerns with their budget at the moment, a consultancy/subcontractor budget could make a big difference. Otherwise everything else still looks ok; the concern is more the timing to make sure we finish on time, rather than the budget.

Year 2

In addition to the work submitted in the WP5 Deliverables, ongoing evaluation continued through the PSG and WP meetings held in Tervuren (January), London (March), Florence (May) and Edinburgh (July) to ensure that all targets were met. While the focus of the meetings in Year 1 of the project was largely developmental, the Year 2 meetings leaned much more to addressing the issues raised in the mid term review and ensuring that all targets were met on time. As indicated earlier, minutes of these meetings will be attached as an appendix to the Project's Final Report.

Sustainability Sub Group Review of Post Project Online Presence, Paris, 30 August 2011

The final meeting of the project was when the Sustainability Sub Group met in Paris during the CIMCIM annual conference, in August 2011. A key element of this meeting was an evaluation of the post-project online presence.

Following presentations to CIMCIM and discussions with a number of delegates, in particular Jo Santy, Communications Manager at MIM-BE, it was agreed that in addition to content being visible through Europeana, we urgently need a website that allows access to the MIMO content only. As very little can be done with the look and interactivity of the MIMO-DB site, it was agreed that a new site with full search capability should be created. As this site will be used for ongoing dissemination and growth of MIMO post project, we need to develop something quickly and make this a priority.

The consensus was that while we will still explore longer term development of a MIMO portal, MIMO-DB is currently the site that will be used most in the immediate post project period and, as such, it is not suitable as the key online legacy of the project. There is a high risk that, in its present form, it will only be used by a very small number of people, as its appearance and usability will not engage a wide audience.

For post project dissemination and particularly in terms of attracting new museums to add content we need a new site that is visually appealing and easy to use.

It was agreed that CM will approach an external graphic designer that they have used before to explore the design element and the team that worked on MIMO-DB to discuss the back-end work.

For the design it was agreed that the overall look needs to be clean, uncluttered and visually appealing.

The logo should be reviewed in the design process and if an alternative can be found quickly this should be considered, however, work on the logo is of secondary importance to improving the site.

The key aim is to make an attractive and easy to use site.

In the short term, the site will be in English only. Other languages may be considered at a later date if the portal is to be developed but at this stage speed is of the essence, as we have to complete the work before the final review.

The Home Page

The home page should contain links to MIMO-DB, the MIMO Toolkit, Europeana, Facebook, Twitter, CIMCIM and ICOM. The current MIMO site should automatically redirect to the new one, as sub pages will include background on the project. We may also have to consider whether we incorporate the content of the MIMO Toolkit into the new site and also redirect visitors from that one.

The home page should also include a list (or link to one) showing all contributing museums, with links back to their home sites. It should be a condition of participation that all museums reciprocate with a “contributor to MIMO” icon.

A counter displaying the number of records in the system should be prominent on the home page.

Search

There should be only one search box on each page. Searching should still be by one of two options - simple or advanced – but the terminology on advanced search process (e.g. Event) needs to be reviewed. The current version uses too much LIDO terminology and this wording is not clear to a wide user group.

Search results should display:

- A thumbnail image of each instrument - this should be in the first column on the left of the screen.
- Place of manufacture.
- The English keyword – this will be of growing importance as new languages are added to the system.

We also need to review how records are displayed as the variable metadata and number of images per instrument currently mean that there is no consistency in the display of information. It was suggested that we use the mandatory image as the one first displayed, with thumbnails to alternatives at the bottom of the record.

Facebook

We need to agree who takes on responsibility for ongoing updating of the Facebook page.

IPR

We need to prepare guidelines on IPR issues and create our own data providers agreement for new museums. It was agreed that we use the Creative Commons [CC-BY-NC-SA](#) licence.

We also need a paragraph in the agreement which makes it clear that any European content that is added will automatically be made available to Europeana and, as such, will have to given under the terms of their agreements.

Exemplar sites

We should come up with a list of web sites which be shown to the designers as examples of good practice. The Cité de la musique search on their education site was shown as a good example – <http://194.250.19.142/medias/medias.aspx?INSTANCE=EXPLOITATION>

Conclusion

Evaluation has been critical to the success of the MIMO. From the initial meeting in Florence at the launch in September 2009 until the project's conclusion, all activity was scrutinised by each Work Package, the Management Team and the Project Steering Group. The result of this was that the project achieved and in some areas exceeded all targets.

Paradoxically, WP5 itself has perhaps been the most difficult and in some ways least successful of the Work Packages, especially in terms of the quality of its Deliverables. As outlined in the report, this was due to a number of factors.

The biggest difficulty faced by this group has been that the wording of its activities (Tasks and Milestones) as outlined in the Description of Work did not, in practice, match the work of the project and this led to some confusion about the output from this WP. This was not helped by that fact that no MIMO content was visible in Europeana during the life of the project, making it very difficult to gain an external opinion, especially from the general public.

Communication between WP5 and other members of the project, particularly in the earlier part of the project, was not good and this definitely contributed to some misunderstanding and a lack of clarity.

Nevertheless, we did address these issues internally and while more might have been done to highlight the quality of evaluative work being done within the partnership as part of the Deliverables, the latter were at least submitted as planned and did cover the areas as indicated in the DoW. While there was a tension between the interpretation of evaluation as stated in the DoW and within the project as a whole, we hope that this report has gone some way to integrate the two areas of activity and demonstrate both the extent of evaluative work and the value that was placed on it by the partnership.

Norman Rodger
September 2011