



LEAF - Linking and Exploring Authority Files

IST-2000-26323

Progress Report 1

DATE	11.11.2001
AUTHOR	Ulrike Beermann
QUALITY ASSURANCE	Hans-Jörg Lieder
WORK PACKAGE	WP 1, Task 1.1
KEYWORDS	Progress Report - Number 1
DELIVERABLE NUMBER	D 1.1-PROGRESS_REP-1

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Comments	Status	Distribution
0.1	24.10.2001	First Progress Report	Draft	SBB's LEAF team
1.0	11.11.2001	Final Version	Final Version	All project personnel and the European Commission

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1 Introduction	4
1.1 Scope	4
1.2 Reporting Procedures	4
1.3 Partner Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
2 Summary of Activities in this Reporting Period	6
3 Details of Activities in this Reporting Period	7
3.1 WP 1 - Management and Administration Management	7
3.1.1 WP 1 – Events	7
3.1.2 WP 1 – Activities	7
3.1.3 WP 1 – Output	9
3.2 WP 2 - Dissemination and Concertation	9
3.2.1 WP 2 – Events	9
3.2.2 WP 2 – Activities	9
3.2.3 WP 2 – Output	11
3.3 WP 3 - Standards Representation	11
3.3.1 WP 3 – Events	11
3.3.2 WP 3 – Activities	11
3.3.3 WP 3 – Output	13
3.4 WP 4 - Data Representation Study	13
3.4.1 WP 4 – Events	13
3.4.2 WP 4 – Activities	13
3.4.3 WP 4 – Output	14
3.5 WP 5.1 - Model requirements analysis	14
3.5.1 WP 5.1 – Events	14
3.5.2 WP 5.1 – Activities	14
3.5.3 WP 5.1 – Output	15
3.6 WP 5.2 - Focussing the model with authority file data	16
3.6.1 WP 5.2 – Events	16
3.6.2 WP 5.2 – Activities	16
3.6.3 WP 5.2 – Output	16
3.7 WP 6 - Functional Specifications of the Demonstrator	16
3.7.1 WP 6 – Events	16
3.7.2 WP 6 – Activities	16
3.7.3 WP 6 – Output	16
3.8 WP 7 - System Development and Preparation of Test Environment	16
3.8.1 WP 7 – Events	16
3.8.2 WP 7 – Activities	16
3.8.3 WP 7 – Output	16
3.9 WP 8 - Test of the Demonstrator	16
3.9.1 WP 8 – Events	16

3.9.2	WP 8 – Activities	17
3.9.3	WP 8 – Output	17
3.10	WP 9 - Model compatibility/ maintenance suite	17
3.10.1	WP 9 – Events	17
3.10.2	WP 9 – Activities	17
3.10.3	WP 9 – Output	17
3.11	WP 10 - Assessment and Evaluation	17
3.11.1	WP 10 – Events	17
3.11.2	WP 10 – Activities	17
3.11.3	WP 10 – Output	17
3.12	WP 11 - Technical Implementation Plan (Exploitation Planning)	17
3.12.1	WP 11 – Events	17
3.12.2	WP 11 – Activities	17
3.12.3	WP 11 – Output	17
4	Project Activities by Recorded Time	18

Introduction

1.1 Scope

This document is the Report number 1 prepared for the Project LEAF (Linking and Exploring Authority Files; project number IST-2000-26323). This document was produced under Work Package 1.1 (*Management and Administration Management*) of the current project. This report covers months 1- 6 (March-August 2001) of the project.

The purpose of this document is to provide a report of the activities undertaken in this reporting period. A descriptive form and a spreadsheet with numerical reporting data are provided. The intended audience of this document is all project personnel and the European Commission.

1.2 Reporting Procedures

LEAF partners are requested to submit quarterly reports indicating the number of man-hours that their respective personnel have worked on the project together with a description of the activities undertaken.

In preparing this report, the information provided by partners in two quarterly reports is analysed and a written description given by Work Package. The numbers of hours are also provided in a spreadsheet form resolved to Work Package and partner granularity.

1.3 Partner Acronyms and Abbreviations

The following table lists the project partners who are actively involved in the project.

BL	British Library
BN	Biblioteca Nacional
CNS	Crossnet Systems Ltd.
DLA	Deutsches Literaturarchiv
FDÖP	Forschungsstelle und Dokumentationszentrum für Österreichische Philosophie
GSA	Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv
IMEC	Institut Mémoire de l'Édition Contemporaine
JRS	Joanneum Research
NUK	National and University Library, Ljubljana, Slovenia
ÖNB	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
RA	Rijksarkivet
SBB	Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin
SNL	Swiss National Library
UCM	Biblioteca de Universidad Complutense de Madrid
UoB	University of Bergen

The following list provides the definitions and abbreviations used within this document.

AG	Arbeitsgruppe
AGPhE	Arbeitsgemeinschaft philosophischer Editionen der Allgemeinen Gesellschaft für

- Philosophie in Deutschland e.V., <http://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/agphe/Subsc.html>
- allegro-HANS** allegro-C für Handschriften, Autographen, Nachlässe und Sammlungen, <http://www.sub.uni-hamburg.de/>
- CA** Consortium Agreement
- DTD** Document Type Definition
- EAC** Encoded Archival Context, <http://bembo.village.virginia.edu/eac.html>
- EAD** Encoded Archival Description, <http://www.loc.gov/ead/>
- GKD** Gemeinsame Körperschaftsdatei,
- ICA** International Council on Archives, <http://www.ica.org/>
- KALLIAS** Elektronische Kataloge und Verzeichnisse des Literaturarchivs, <http://www.dla-marbach.de/kallias/kallias.html>
- LEAF** Linking and Exploring Authority Files, <http://www.leaf-eu.org>
- LoC** Library of Congress, <http://www.loc.gov/>
- MARC** Machine Readable Cataloguing, <http://www.loc.gov/marc/>
- MARC21** Machine Readable Cataloguing, <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdhome.html>
- MRAD** Model Requirements Analysis Document
- OCLC** Online Computer Library Center, <http://www.oclc.org/home/>
- ODOK** Österreichisches Online-Informationstreffen, <http://voeb.uibk.ac.at/odok2001/>
- ÖBIBV** Österreichischer Bibliothekenverbund, <http://www.bibvb.ac.at/>
- PCC** Project Co-ordination Committee
- PND** Personennamendatei, <http://www.ddb.de/professionell/pnd.htm>
- RLG** Research Libraries Group, <http://www.rlg.org/>
- SEPIA** Safeguarding European Photographic Images for Access, <http://www.knaw.nl/ecpa/sepia/>
- UNIMARC** Universal Machine Readable Cataloguing, <http://www.ifla.org/VI/3/p1996-1/sec-uni.htm>
- VEKTOR** VEKTOR, European Contemporary Art Archives, <http://www.vektor.at/>
- VÖB** Vereinigung Österreichischer Bibliothekarinnen und Bibliothekare, <http://www.uibk.ac.at/sci-org/voeb/>
- WP** Work Package
- XML** Extensible Markup Language, <http://www.w3.org/XML/>

2 Summary of Activities in this Reporting Period

The project kicked off successfully in early March where partners were introduced to each other and the project intentions and procedures were clearly defined to everyone.

The project has attracted a wide international interest, and there are 29 observing partners to the project at the time of writing this report.

In addition to the kick-off meeting, a PCC meeting and a Task meeting have been held. All partners have had the opportunity to fully appreciate their involvement in LEAF, and their obligations thereto.

In addition to administrative preparations, the project activities have focussed towards the initial Work Packages and tasks, for dissemination and user requirements.

The initial deliverables have been produced (administration documents and web site), although further work on the web site is foreseen, such as the multilingual aspects. Reporting procedures have been defined and adopted by all partners.

Partners with authority data have provided definitions and descriptions of their data (concerning both person names and corporate bodies), and this has been passed to UoB for assessment of the data with respect to XML and DTDs.

The project has established initial contacts with standards bodies, and in particular the EAC working group, where a DTD is being prepared and expected to be available early 2002.

Overall, the project has commenced with a good start, and commenced well in the second quarter, despite the usual effects of the summer vacation period getting in the way. The initial deliverables have now all been loaded to the project document store, and partners have submitted their reports for the second project progress report.

A data providers meeting was held in Berlin, where the Portuguese partner proposed a LEAF system model to the partners. Unfortunately, as JRS were not at this meeting, initial feedback from a technical perspective could not be ascertained, but it could be seen that the model differed somewhat from that in the technical annex.

Where required, partners have provided their user scenario descriptions, and these are now being further analysed. The user scenarios have provided useful input to the design of the user requirements online questionnaire, and this was also completed, translated to several languages and posted on the web site. Several hundred persons were identified for possible candidates for the online survey.

3 Details of Activities in this Reporting Period

3.1 WP 1 - Management and Administration Management

3.1.1 WP 1 – Events

The LEAF kick-off meeting took place at UCM, Madrid, 5 March 2001.

The first LEAF PCC meeting took place at UCM, Madrid, 6 March 2001.

There was a data providers meeting in Berlin on August 23 – 24.

3.1.2 WP 1 – Activities

Task 1.1: Administration Management

All partners reported preparation of their local infrastructure for the LEAF project with provision of information for the project administration documents and use of the document store.

JRS reported preparation of the project document store, the documentation template and project email list.

SBB undertook:

- making contacts to new observing partners and administration of all observing partners' needs;
- preparation and negotiation of the draft LEAF Consortium Agreement;
- internal discussions of the Consortium Agreement including all legal aspects;
- consultations with the project manager regarding basic project procedures;
- consultations with the project manager regarding the general progress of the project.

CNS provided guidance and advice to various partners concerning project administration aspects.

ÖNB reported setting up of their local project infrastructure and administration.

BL, BN, GSA, IMEC, ÖNB, SNL and UoB reported undertaking general project administration.

DLA has prepared and contributed to Report 1 and updated it's internal accounting tools to support task level reporting. These tools have been made available to the consortium and are in use at several sites.

JRS, SNL undertook various discussions with SBB concerning the CA.

Task 1.2 Project Management

NUK, SNL and RA reported assessment of the project consortium agreement and local project administration.

SBB reported:

- Provision of input to the project guide including proof reading of the first draft;
- Further proof-reading of the Project Guide;

- Quality assurance and acceptance of the Management Deliverables;
- Quality assurance and acceptance of the first Project Report.

CNS prepared the first versions of the project guide and project management plan deliverables.

CNS updated the project guide and the project management plan.

CNS prepared the first project report.

All partners reported submission of their project reporting details.

JRS reported undertaking administration of document store and planning of resources within the LEAF project (technical equipment and personal resources).

NUK reported reading of the Project Guide and the Project Management Plan.

RA reported undertaking of various internal management and contacts with the administrative division of RA.

SNL reported various internal organisation management pertaining to the project.

Task 1.3: Meetings

All partners reported attendance of the kick-off meeting in Madrid.

All main partners attended the PCC meeting in Madrid.

Most partners reported attendance at the data providers' task meeting at ÖNB on 17th May 2001.

A technical task meeting was held at JRS, Graz, on 18th May 2001 attended by SBB, JRS, NUK, UoB and RA.

NUK attended a meeting in Graz of the Austrian Literary Archives on the 10th May 2001.

SBB reported:

- preparation of the kick-off meeting in Madrid, 05.03.2001;
- preparation of the minutes of the kick-off meeting in Madrid;
- preparation of and participation in a data providers' task meeting in Vienna, 17.05.2001;
- preparation of the minutes of the data providers' task meeting in Vienna, 17.05.2001;
- preparation of and participation in a meeting on authority file issues with project participants and non-participants in Vienna, 17.05.2001;
- preparation of the Berlin data providers meeting and also the preparation of the minutes of that meeting.

ÖNB reported preparation of the kick-off meeting, preparation of the Vienna task meeting, and preparation of the kick-off meeting minutes.

UoB, SBB, BL, FDÖP, IMEC, RA, SNL and DLA reported attendance at the data providers' meeting in Berlin (August 23, 24).

UoB reported on the activities of the developers meeting held in Graz.

Task 1.4: Final report

There was no activity on this task in the reporting period.

3.1.3 WP 1 – Output

Project document store.

Project documentation template.

Minutes of kick-off meeting.

Minutes of task meeting in Vienna.

Project Guide.

Project Management Plan.

Project quarterly reports.

Draft Consortium Agreement.

3.2 WP 2 - Dissemination and Concertation

3.2.1 WP 2 – Events

There were no project events for this WP in the reporting period.

3.2.2 WP 2 – Activities

Task 2.1: Creation and Administration of the Project Website

CNS prepared the project web site and made various changes according to partner feedback.

Most partners reported provision of feedback to the project web site including testing of the feedback form.

UoB provided Norwegian translations of the project web site.

SBB linked the project domain to the web site computer at CNS.

SBB provided input to and proof-reading of the LEAF Website.

SBB, SNL and IMEC provided input to and proof-reading of the online version of the questionnaire at the LEAF Website.

SBB provided comments to CNS about the questionnaire website after having received feedback during the survey phase.

SNL undertook preparation of information about LEAF on the SNL web site.

ÖNB reported testing of the LEAF web site and providing feedback to CNS.

Task 2.2 Dissemination of results

IMEC provided dissemination of the project information to IMEC's partners.

DLA introduced LEAF to the Technical Commission of the Philosophical Editions Working Group (AGPhE, Arbeitsgemeinschaft philosophischer Editionen der Allgemeinen Gesellschaft für Philosophie in Deutschland e.V.) at a members meeting in Tübingen.

DLA announced the LEAF project and its web pages to the mailing lists e-edition@dla-marbach.de (public; Diskussionsliste "E-Edition" am Deutschen Literaturarchiv Marbach, <http://www.eliber.de/rk/links/eedit.htm>) and agphe@bbaw.de (commission members only; AGPhE, Arbeitsgemeinschaft philosophischer Editionen der Allgemeinen Gesellschaft für Philosophie in Deutschland e.V., <http://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/agphe/Subsc.html>).

RA produced papers and presentations of LEAF for:

- the EU Conference "Access to Archives" in Lund (Sweden) 5-6 April 2001;
- SEPIA meeting concerning photo-archives, Stockholm 26 April 2001;
- the 6th European Conference on Archives, Florence, 31 May-2 June 2001;
- the "Section of Bibliographic Development and Coordination" at the Royal Library (the National Library of Sweden) for co-ordination of authority records.

RA provided information about LEAF on their home page.

RA provided information about LEAF for:

- the Conference for European archivists at ministries for foreign affairs (7 June, Stockholm);
- a Conference for European audiovisual archivists (8 June, Stockholm);
- preparatory material for the LEAF newsletter.

UoB provided information about LEAF on their local web pages.

UoB disseminated information about LEAF among co-operational partners in Norway.

JRS gave project presentations on the "Österreichische Buchmesse" and "Österreichischer Literaturarchivtag".

JRS gave an internal project presentation.

SBB gave a presentation of LEAF at the conference "Museums and the Web", Seattle, USA, 16.03.2001.

SBB held meetings at RLG, Mountain View, California (19.03.2001), OCLC, Dublin/Ohio (21.03.2001), LoC, Washington DC (23.03.2001) with presentations of LEAF.

SBB undertook participation at the "Deutscher Bibliothekarstag" in Bielefeld with presentation of LEAF (02.-04.04.2001).

SBB gave a presentation of LEAF at a National Information Day for Austrian archivists and librarians, organised by the Austrian National Library (16.05.2001).

SBB gave a presentation of LEAF at the conference "Digital access to book trade archives" at the Dutch National Library in Den Haag (31.05.-01.06.2001).

SBB undertook the following:

- Presentation of LEAF at the University of Opole, Poland (06.08.2001);
- Preparation of an article for the online journal "D-Lib", scheduled to be published by mid-September (<http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september01/09inbrief.html>)

FDÖP, ÖNB and JRS gave a presentation of LEAF at the Annual Meeting of the Austrian Literary Archives in Graz (May 10th 2001).

ÖNB reported presentation of LEAF at the VÖB meeting and writing of a report about LEAF for ÖNB.

ÖNB reported preparation of a LEAF presentation at ODOK'01, Graz.

ÖNB reported writing an article of LEAF for 'Palatina aktuell'.

ÖNB undertook preparation of and gave a LEAF Presentation for AG Normdateien.

UCM provided comments to the "Dissemination and Use Plan".

3.2.3 WP 2 – Output

The initial LEAF project web site and various web pages at project partners web sites.

3.3 WP 3 - Standards Representation

3.3.1 WP 3 – Events

There were no project events for this WP in the reporting period.

3.3.2 WP 3 – Activities

Task 3.1: LEAF Maintenance Agency

There were no activities reported for this task in the reporting period.

Task 3.2: Metadata

NUK undertook:

- a survey of draft set of metadata elements and qualifiers;
- creation of a national draft metadata set for authority files; preparation of English version.

BN reported provision of descriptions of their local metadata formats.

BN undertook analysis of the local scenarios and metadata descriptions.

IMEC reported an analysis of existing metadata formats as applicable to their data.

IMEC undertook an analysis of existing XML formats relevant to the project.

IMEC undertook an analysis of their existing formats.

RA has held working meetings and correspondence with the EAC group (Encoded Archival Context).

UoB has reported evaluation of metadata proposals and exploring with mapping possibilities.

BL undertook various analysis for data provision and planning of the LEAF model.

ÖNB undertook analysis of their metadata.

FDÖP undertook an analysis and description of their biographical metadata used in the local database and tried to map local metadata with the metadata used by the other data providers of the LEAF-project.

JRS participated in various discussions and commented on available information regarding the technical solution discussed in Berlin.

UCM undertook preparation of the UCM metadata profile for personal names and corporate bodies.

SBB undertook:

- preparation of a draft version of an accumulated metadata profile for the description of person names;
- further work on the draft version of an accumulated metadata profile for the description of person names;
- preparation of a draft version of an accumulated metadata profile for the description of corporate bodies.

Task 3.3: Partnerships and Cooperations

NUK held various concertation activities at the national library and also created an archival metadata set for authority files (meetings, surveys of draft sets etc.)

IMEC gave a presentation of LEAF for a new observing partner.

IMEC undertook co-operation with a new observing partner.

UoB has reported co-operation with and participation in the international EAC working group, esp. the group meeting in Toronto, March 3rd to 6th. This also includes work on the EAC-DTD.

UoB undertook co-operation with the standardization body for EAD (ISA).

JRS reported contact with Jeff Young of OCLC concerning their name authority proposal.

ÖNB reported preparatory work for the identification of possible cooperations.

ÖNB held a partnership meeting with the VEKTOR-Project and undertook an analysis of other possible partnerships.

RA held working meetings and correspondence with the EAC group (Encoded Archival Context).

3.3.3 WP 3 – Output

Initial and further drafts of the metadata document were produced.

3.4 WP 4 - Data Representation Study

3.4.1 WP 4 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.4.2 WP 4 – Activities

GSA reported provision of the specification of their data to UoB.

GSA prepared their metadata table for corporate bodies.

DLA reported compilation of information on their local data formats for UoB.

DLA undertook an analysis of LEAF metadata drafts (in comparison to local standards), including corporate bodies as well.

RA reported participation in the development of the EAC DTD document.

RA has participated in the development of the EAC DTD and the adoption of it for use in LEAF.

UoB reported establishing contact with the data providers and collection of local storage and export format details. This included whether data providers retain separate authority files from their main catalogues. This information was preliminarily analysed against the proposed EAC DTD. In addition, some preliminary conversion tools were tested for conversion of UNIMARC and MARC21 to XML.

UoB has prepared the provisional report on the recommended name DTD.

UoB has undertaken a mapping between the name DTD and the name metadata set.

SBB reported provision of input to the preliminary name DTD.

SBB has provided input to the name DTD and provided test data to UoB.

SNL provided sample data of their system to UoB.

ÖNB has prepared input material for UoB of the metadata formats of their allegro-HANS persons and corporate bodies data.

UCM has prepared and provided examples of their exported data from their person and corporate body name authority files in both text and MARC formats.

UCM reported sending details about their system and authority file to UoB.

IMEC undertook an analysis of various XML formats related to the project.

IMEC has prepared their users' scenario and the definition of a model user scenario.

3.4.3 WP 4 – Output

There was no output from this WP in the reporting period.

3.5 WP 5.1 - Model requirements analysis

3.5.1 WP 5.1 – Events

A task meeting was held in Vienna on 15/5/01.

3.5.2 WP 5.1 – Activities

Task 5.1.1: Analysis of input data

BL undertook a description of their data format and produced a brief state of the art paper for this.

IMEC provided an internal identification of their users' scenario and a definition of a model user scenario.

DLA has undertaken the following:

- compiled and translated several documents on local data format descriptions and practice and contributed to the first metadata draft;
- possible LEAF test data pools have been evaluated and described including the database system KALLIAS, the publishing project "Internationales Germanisten Lexikon" und the edition "Tagebücher Harry Graf Kessler";
- written and tested a first version of an export procedure for KALLIAS authority file test data (persons only until now).

FDÖP commenced work on a description of their typical user scenarios of biographical user queries of their database.

FDÖP finalized a description of the typical user scenarios of biographical queries within their database. Their user scenario was then integrated in the user scenario synopsis.

BN provided comments to the discussions of the LEAF model.

BN provided analysis of the contributions and definition of the LEAF model and users scenarios.

ÖNB reported analysis of input data of ÖBIBVB-GKD, ÖBIBVB-PND, ÖNB-Star.

GSA has prepared their user scenario, and undertaken a check of the other reported user scenarios.

UCM has provided a description of their user scenario.

JRS has held various discussions and commented on available information regarding the technical solution.

SNL provided a description of their data structure.

SNL has undertaken provision of metadata for corporate bodies mapping this to the LEAF metadata table.

SNL has studied and discussed the proposed LEAF model and user scenarios.

RA has undertaken an analysis of some of the user scenarios and prepared reports accordingly.

SBB has provided input to the MRAD-1 document.

CNS has prepared the LEAF web based user survey infrastructure.

Task 5.1.2: Definition of User Groups

SBB has undertaken:

- preparation of a draft version of the accumulated user scenarios;
- further work on the draft version of accumulated user scenarios, checking of scenarios submitted by partners;
- discussion and focus of the LEAF model according to partner needs and user group needs;
- analysis of user scenarios at various partners' local systems with a view on integrating functionalities into the LEAF model.

ÖNB has undertaken an analysis of the various user scenarios.

Task 5.1.3: User Survey

CNS commenced preparation of the LEAF user survey web questionnaire, by designing a database schema for the results to be stored and web page forms for the data to be entered.

ÖNB reported preparation and design of the LEAF survey questionnaire.

ÖNB assisted in the preparation of the user survey, and also undertook testing of the online questionnaire.

ÖNB commenced analysis of the user survey results.

BN has undertaken dissemination of the user survey.

DLA checked the draft user questionnaires and suggested some improvements.

RA undertook a review of the user survey questionnaire.

UCM prepared the Spanish version of the online questionnaire and announced the questionnaire to various professional mailing lists.

SBB undertook:

- cooperation with ÖNB regarding outlay, design and scope of the user survey;
- cooperation with CNS regarding users' difficulties with the user survey;
- processing of initial user feedback.

SNL undertook proof-reading of the user survey.

Task 5.1.4: Identification of Services

No activities were reported for this task.

3.5.3 WP 5.1 – Output

Various draft technical notes were produced, being intended as drafts for deliverables.

The online user survey questionnaire was provided.

3.6 WP 5.2 - Focussing the model with authority file data

3.6.1 WP 5.2 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.6.2 WP 5.2 – Activities

JRS held internal discussions and provided comments to the proposed LEAF model, based on information provided.

3.6.3 WP 5.2 – Output

There was no output for this WP in the reporting period.

3.7 WP 6 - Functional Specifications of the Demonstrator

3.7.1 WP 6 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.7.2 WP 6 – Activities

JRS commenced initial activities on this task to gain time to take the actual discussions of data schema and model into account.

3.7.3 WP 6 – Output

There was no output for this WP in the reporting period.

3.8 WP 7 - System Development and Preparation of Test Environment

3.8.1 WP 7 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.8.2 WP 7 – Activities

There were no activities reported for this WP in the reporting period.

3.8.3 WP 7 – Output

There was no output for this WP in the reporting period.

3.9 WP 8 - Test of the Demonstrator

3.9.1 WP 8 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.9.2 WP 8 – Activities

There were no activities reported for this WP in the reporting period.

3.9.3 WP 8 – Output

There was no output for this WP in the reporting period.

3.10 WP 9 - Model compatibility/ maintenance suite

3.10.1 WP 9 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.10.2 WP 9 – Activities

There were no activities reported for this WP in the reporting period.

3.10.3 WP 9 – Output

There was no output for this WP in the reporting period.

3.11 WP 10 - Assessment and Evaluation

3.11.1 WP 10 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.11.2 WP 10 – Activities

There were no activities reported for this WP in the reporting period.

3.11.3 WP 10 – Output

There was no output for this WP in the reporting period.

3.12 WP 11 - Technical Implementation Plan (Exploitation Planning)

3.12.1 WP 11 – Events

There were no events relating to this WP in the reporting period.

3.12.2 WP 11 – Activities

There were no activities reported for this WP in the reporting period.

3.12.3 WP 11 – Output

There was no output for this WP in the reporting period.

4 Project Activities by Recorded Time

This section contains information on budget and reported man hours.

The subsequent tables contain details of the Work Packages listing the budgeted man hours, used man hours and remaining man hours for each partner.

In addition, there is an overall summary of budgeted, used and remaining WP hours represented in tabular and graphical formats.

Please note that the LEAF project is working at a rate of 17.5 productive person days per month.

Each partners monthly rate is shown.

Work Package / Task	SBB	DLA	JRS	FDOP	UoB	CNS	ONB	BN	UCM	SNL	NUK	IMEC	BL	GSA	RA
hours per month	135	135	140	140	131	131	140	123	128	152	131	131	126	140	131
1 Mgmt. & Admin Mgmt.															
Budgeted hours	3638	270	420	280	328	1050	350	306	319	305	328	327	252	280	328
Booked to date	633.0	87.0	118.3	76.0	22.5	138.0	123.0	56.0	65.0	102.0	270.0	227.0	104.0	104.5	152.0
Remaining	3005.3	182.5	301.7	204.0	305.6	912.0	227.0	250.3	254.4	202.5	58.1	100.3	148.0	175.5	176.1
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2 Dissemination & Concertation															
Budgeted hours	673.8	67.4	140.0	70.0	525.0	656.3	560.0	61.3	766.5	76.1	262.5	392.7	63.0	70.0	65.6
Booked to date	246.0	1.5	63.0	10.0	14.0	117.5	153.0	35.0	4.0	2.5	30.0	54.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
Remaining	427.8	65.9	77.0	60.0	511.0	538.8	407.0	26.3	762.5	73.6	232.5	338.7	63.0	70.0	25.6
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3 Standards Representation															
Budgeted hours	808.5		140.0		459.4	328.1	630.0	428.8	63.9		65.6	65.5			262.5
Booked to date	379.0		61.3		203.0	0.0	106.0	105.0	16.0		200.0	24.0			104.0
Remaining	429.5		78.7		256.4	328.1	524.0	323.8	47.9		-134.4	41.5			158.5
Overrun	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		134.4	0.0			0.0
4 Data Representation Study															
Budgeted hours	539.0	67.4	70.0	70.0	2625.0		280.0	245.0	255.5	76.1	262.5	261.8	63.0	70.0	262.5
Booked to date	70.0	46.5	0.0	0.0	570.0		48.0	0.0	30.0	0.8	0.0	43.0	0.0	8.0	36.0
Remaining	469.0	20.9	70.0	70.0	2055.0		232.0	245.0	225.5	75.4	262.5	218.8	63.0	62.0	226.5
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Work Package / Task	SBB	DLA	JRS	FDOP	UoB	CNS	ONB	BN	UCM	SNL	NUK	IMEC	BL	GSA	RA
5.1 Model Requirements Analysis															
Budgeted hours	1347.5	67.4	280.0	70.0	262.5	262.5	840.0	490.0	63.9	76.1	262.5	65.5	63.0	70.0	262.5
Booked to date	527.0	89.5	248.0	84.0	0.0	215.5	403.0	287.0	32.0	25.5	0.0	50.0	60.0	11.0	8.0
Remaining	820.5	-22.1	32.0	-14.0	262.5	47.0	437.0	203.0	31.9	50.6	262.5	15.5	3.0	59.0	254.5
Overrun	0.0	22.1	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5.2 Focus the Model															
Budgeted hours	808.5	67.4	280.0	70.0	65.6	65.6	630.0	980.0	63.9	76.1	393.8	65.5	63.0	70.0	525.0
Booked to date	0.0	0.0	57.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remaining	808.5	67.4	223.0	70.0	65.6	65.6	630.0	980.0	63.9	76.1	393.8	65.5	63.0	70.0	525.0
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6 Functional Spec of Demonstrator															
Budgeted hours	134.8		1400.0		131.3	131.3	140.0	122.5	127.8	76.1	131.3	130.9			131.3
Booked to date	0.0		34.3		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0
Remaining	134.8		1365.8		131.3	131.3	140.0	122.5	127.8	76.1	131.3	130.9			131.3
Overrun	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0
7 System Development															
Budgeted hours	539.0	336.9	4060.0	350.0	1443.8	393.8	980.0	306.3	319.4		459.4	327.3	315.0	350.0	459.4
Booked to date	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remaining	539.0	336.9	4060.0	350.0	1443.8	393.8	980.0	306.3	319.4		459.4	327.3	315.0	350.0	459.4
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Work Package / Task	SBB	DLA	JRS	FDOP	UoB	CNS	ONB	BN	UCM	SNL	NUK	IMEC	BL	GSA	RA
8 Test of the Demonstrator															
Budgeted hours	269.5	134.8	420.0	140.0			630.0	245.0	255.5		787.5	261.8	126.0	140.0	328.1
Booked to date	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remaining	269.5	134.8	420.0	140.0			630.0	245.0	255.5		787.5	261.8	126.0	140.0	328.1
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9 Maintenance Suite															
Budgeted hours	202.1	202.1	280.0	210.0	196.9	1312.5	210.0	183.8	191.6	228.4	196.9	196.4	189.0	210.0	196.9
Booked to date	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remaining	202.1	202.1	280.0	210.0	196.9	1312.5	210.0	183.8	191.6	228.4	196.9	196.4	189.0	210.0	196.9
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10 Assessment and Evaluation															
Budgeted hours	539.0	269.5	140.0	280.0	262.5		420.0	245.0	255.5	532.9	262.5	261.8	126.0	280.0	262.5
Booked to date	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remaining	539.0	269.5	140.0	280.0	262.5		420.0	245.0	255.5	532.9	262.5	261.8	126.0	280.0	262.5
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11 Exploitation Planning															
Budgeted hours	269.5	67.4	70.0	70.0	65.6	262.5	280.0	61.3	63.9	76.1	65.6	65.5	63.0	70.0	262.5
Booked to date	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remaining	269.5	67.4	70.0	70.0	65.6	262.5	280.0	61.3	63.9	76.1	65.6	65.5	63.0	70.0	262.5
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Totals by Work Package

	Budget Totals	Used	Percentage Used
1 Mgmt. & Admin Mgmt.	8781.5	2278.3	25.9
2 Dissemination & Concertation	4450.1	450.0	10.1
3 Standards Representation	3252.2	758.0	23.3
4 Data Representation Study	5147.8	735.8	14.3
5.1 Model Requirements Analysis	4483.3	1092.0	24.4
5.2 Focus the Model	4224.3	0.0	0.0
6 Functional Spec of Demonstrator	2657.0	0.0	0.0
7 System Development	10640.0	0.0	0.0
8 Test of the Demonstrator	3738.2	0.0	0.0
9 Maintenance Suite	4206.5	0.0	0.0
10 Assessment and Evaluation	4137.2	0.0	0.0
11 Exploitation Planning	1812.8	0.0	0.0
Totals:	57530.9	5314.0	9.2

Totals by Partner	Total	Budget
Partner	Budget	Used to Date
	(hours)	(hours)
SBB	9769	1855
DLA	1550	225
JRS	7700	582
FDÖP	1610	170
UoB	6366	810
CNS	4463	471
ÖNB	5950	833
BN	3675	483
UCM	2747	147
SNL	1523	131
NUK	3478	500
IMEC	2422	398
BL	1323	164
GSA	1610	124
RA	3347	340

