



LEAF - Linking and Exploring Authority Files

IST-2000-26323

Progress Report 2

DATE 14.05.2002

AUTHOR Ulrike Beermann

QUALITY ASSURANCE Hans-Jörg Lieder

WORK PACKAGE WP 1, Task 1.1

KEYWORDS Progress Report - Number 2

DELIVERABLE NUMBER D 1.1-PROGRESS_REP-2

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Comments	Status	Distribution
0.1	13.05.2002	First Progress Report	Draft	SBB's LEAF team
1.0	14.05.2002	Final Version	Final Version	All project personnel and the European Commission

Table of Contents

<u>Table of Contents</u>	2
<u>1.1 Scope</u>	4
<u>1.2 Reporting Procedures</u>	4
<u>1.3 Partner Acronyms and Abbreviations</u>	4
<u>2 Summary of Activities in this Reporting Period</u>	6
<u>3 Details of Activities in this Reporting Period</u>	8
<u>3.1 WP 1 - Management and Administration Management</u>	8
3.1.1 <u>WP 1 – Events</u>	8
3.1.2 <u>WP 1 – Activities</u>	8
3.1.3 <u>WP 1 – Output</u>	9
<u>3.2 WP 2 - Dissemination and Concertation</u>	10
3.2.1 <u>WP 2 – Events</u>	10
3.2.2 <u>WP 2 – Activities</u>	10
3.2.3 <u>WP 2 – Output</u>	11
<u>3.3 WP 3 - Standards Representation</u>	11
3.3.1 <u>WP 3 – Events</u>	11
3.3.2 <u>WP 3 – Activities</u>	11
3.3.3 <u>WP 3 – Output</u>	12
<u>3.4 WP 4 - Data Representation Study</u>	12
3.4.1 <u>WP 4 – Events</u>	12
3.4.2 <u>WP 4 – Activities</u>	12
3.4.3 <u>WP 4 – Output</u>	13
<u>3.5 WP 5.1 - Model requirements analysis</u>	13
3.5.1 <u>WP 5.1 – Events</u>	13
3.5.2 <u>WP 5.1 – Activities</u>	13
3.5.3 <u>WP 5.1 – Output</u>	14
<u>3.6 WP 5.2 - Focussing the model with authority file data</u>	15
3.6.1 <u>WP 5.2 – Events</u>	15
3.6.2 <u>WP 5.2 – Activities</u>	15
3.6.3 <u>WP 5.2 – Output</u>	15
<u>3.7 WP 6 - Functional Specifications of the Demonstrator</u>	16
3.7.1 <u>WP 6 – Events</u>	16
3.7.2 <u>WP 6 – Activities</u>	16
3.7.3 <u>WP 6 – Output</u>	16
<u>3.8 WP 7 - System Development and Preparation of Test Environment</u>	16
3.8.1 <u>WP 7 – Events</u>	16
3.8.2 <u>WP 7 – Activities</u>	16
3.8.3 <u>WP 7 – Output</u>	16
<u>3.9 WP 8 - Test of the Demonstrator</u>	16
3.9.1 <u>WP 8 – Events</u>	16
3.9.2 <u>WP 8 – Activities</u>	16
3.9.3 <u>WP 8 – Output</u>	16

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

Introduction

1.1 Scope

This document is the Progress Report number 2 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 7-12 (September-February 2002) 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
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.

ADD	Architectural Design Document
AG	Arbeitsgruppe (i.e. Working Group)

- ALM** Archives, Libraries, Museums, <http://www.kb.se/BIBSAM/english/alm/first.htm>
- CALM** Collection Management System for Archives, Museums, Records Management and Local Studies Collections, http://www.ds.co.uk/company/files/calm_menu.html
- CERL** Consortium of European Research Libraries, <http://www.cerl.org>
- DCMI** Dublin Core Metadata Initiative, <http://dublincore.org>
- DoW** Description of Work
- DS** Dokimas
- DTD** Document Type Description
- EAD** Encoded Archival Description, <http://www.loc.gov/ead>
- EC/NSF DL** European Commission/National Science Foundation Digital Libraries, <http://www.nsf.gov/home/int/europe/index.htm>
- EAD** Encoded Archival Description, <http://www.loc.gov/ead/>
- FTP** File Transfer Protocol
- GKD** Gemeinsame Körperschaftsdatei, <http://www.ddb.de/professionell/gkd.htm>
- ICD** Interface Control Document
- ICLA** International Council of Literary Archives
- ISAAR** International Standard Archival Authority Record, <http://www.ica.org/biblio/com/cds/isaare.html>
- IT** Information Technology
- KALLIAS** Name of the database of DLA, <http://www.dla-marbach.de/kallias/kallias.html>
- LEAF** Linking and Exploring Authority Files, <http://www.leaf-eu.org>
- MALVINE** Manuscripts and Letters Via Integrated Networks in Europe, <http://www.malvine.org>
- MARC21** Bibliographic and Holdings Format of the MARC (Machine Readable Cataloguing) family of formats, <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdhome.html>
- MRAD** Model Requirements Analysis Document
- OAI** Open Archives Initiative, <http://www.openarchives.org>
- PND** Personennamendatei, <http://www.ddb.de/professionell/pnd.htm>
- SWD** Schlagwortnormdatei, <http://www.ddb.de/professionell/swd.htm>
- TEL** The European Library, <http://www.europeanlibrary.org>
- WP** Work Package
- XML** Extensible Markup Language, <http://www.w3.org/XML/>
- ZKA** Zentralkartei der Autographen, <http://Staatsbibliothek-Berlin.de/deutsch/abteilungen/handschriftenabteilung/aufgaben.html#autographen>

2 Summary of Activities in this Reporting Period

This report is produced following one year of the project being completed. After the summer vacation period the project continued at a strong pace, however a number of difficult areas emerged concerning technologies and architectural aspects of the LEAF model. These difficulties originated from a proposal at the data provider meeting in Berlin (August) to modify the LEAF system architecture against the proposed model in the DoW. The most important modification concerns the concept of a central LEAF data repository into which all local authority records will be copied and stored in a suitable exchange format, i.e. EAC. The most important reason for this modification was the issue of system performance, which was thought to be not sufficient in respect to the indexing/linking mechanisms taking place.

There followed a period of considerable debate over the email list, culminating to the point of SBB splitting the attendees of the Caen meeting (representing all partners) to a number of Working Groups, each with a different topic to discuss, and each focussing on requirements of the Model, with a view on analysing all aspects and implications of the modified LEAF model.

In the period that followed the Caen meeting, each Working Group continued with their group activities, and a Working Group meeting was scheduled in Graz to summarize and formulate proposals to the project team to formally take decisions on how to proceed. This Working Group meeting took place in November, one member from each of the Working Group teams being present to report on WG activities.

It has to be stated that most other partners had not voiced their opinions by that time, and a project vote was established in December asking partners how they were willing to provide their data to the LEAF model, whereby a huge majority of partners expressed a preference of using conventional means such as ftp/email etc to submit their data.

Consequentially, the LEAF model requirements were considerably clarified, and more constructive discussion was exposed in terms of:

- real-time access to partners authority data vs. performance of the indexing/linking mechanism,
- consideration to selectivity of authority data entries from authority files pertaining to particular subjects;
- inclusion of partners who only wished to provide real-time distributed access to their data.

A so-called "hybrid" model was devised accommodating these key requirements, and this resulted in a broader set of requirements than stated in the DoW, but these are requirements that can be realistically tested in the project. The main aspect of this "hybrid" model is that those OPACs which can provide Z39.50 technologies will, after an initial data upload to the central LEAF data repository, be queried online, whereas other OPACs will provide their data - including local updates of data already provided to the LEAF system - to the central data repository by other standard forms of data transfer (FTP, OAI, SOAP). In addition to the model discussions, considerable discussions took place concerning the design and linking of the authority records, exposing a considerably complicated set of requirements and linking mechanisms dealing with updates, annotations etc.

On the whole, the problems have now been resolved, and the delay caused by discussing a modified system architecture can be recovered by addressing the timings of subsequent tasks.

Following the difficult first quarter of disagreement and significant discussion concerning the LEAF model, it is good to note that these issues were resolved in the second quarter of the reporting period.

These difficulties have warranted a higher degree of precision and workload in the area of WP 5.1 and this will probably lead to an increased workload in WP 5.2 due to the high degree of complexity, detail and quantity that is required in these documents. As a consequence, the delivery of these has been later than

anticipated. However, analysis of the WP planning indicates that this will not necessarily affect the deployment work packages because WP 6 has been started by partner JRS as scheduled, and this is running in parallel with WP5.2. This is made possible by addressing those areas of requirements that were substantiated earlier in WP 5.1 and 5.2 to which there were no issues arising.

Analysis of the recorded time shows that some partners are using their budget in WP 1 at a far higher rate than budgeted. This should not be of any real surprise as this seems to always happen in these projects. The forthcoming plenary meeting in Slovenia, hosted by partner NUK, is including an agenda item to address budget distribution including a formal contractual change request to the Commission in this respect, but also a proposed shift of budget - only applicable to JRS - due to the modifications of the LEAF system architecture.

There are also instances of budget overrun evident in WP 3 and WP5.1 by some partners - again with no surprise for WP 5.1 due to the intense period over the last 6 months. The approach of creating working groups for WP 5.1 enabled this WP to proceed on a positive note in several strands, and the main deliverable documents (the MRAD parts) are well under way.

There have not been any project events in the last 3 months of this reporting period, due to the winter and vacation period, but the planned plenary meeting will take place soon in April 2002.

The Consortium Agreement having been finalised is now under circulation to all partners, although this seems to be a very slow process.

The end of this period saw partners starting to prepare for the forthcoming plenary meeting, and also for the next cost claim process, and the project in general continues very well.

3 Details of Activities in this Reporting Period

3.1 WP 1 - Management and Administration Management

3.1.1 WP 1 – Events

There was a Working Group Meeting in Caen hosted by IMEC on 27, 28 September 2001.

There was a Working Group Meeting in Graz hosted by JRS on 19, 20 November 2001.

SBB undertook a working visit to the BL on 22.-26 October 2001, including a visit to Crossnet on 26 October 2001.

3.1.2 WP 1 – Activities

Task 1.1: Administration Management

BL, BN, DLA, SBB, GSA, IMEC, ÖNB, JRS, SNL, FDÖP and UoB reported general administration, local management, processing of the first cost claim and project reporting. SNL and UCM reported activities related to the first cost claim.

JRS, SNL, CNS and SBB reported discussions concerning the Consortium Agreement. SBB reported further negotiation of the LEAF Consortium Agreement with project partners and discussions of the Consortium Agreement including all legal aspects with their local administration.

CNS held many internal discussions in considering whether Crossnet has a technical part to play in the project if the model and technical components are changed - e.g: impact on the compatibility/maintenance suite; to the extent whether Crossnet should consider pulling out of the project altogether.

SBB reported administration of all observing partners' needs, including the establishing of an Observers' Section at the project's document store. SBB also held intensive discussions with the project manager regarding the general progress of the project. SBB reported the preparation and quality assurance of the first Management Report.

Task 1.2 Project Management

CNS reported significant project management and planning activities - ascertaining the impact that a potential change of technologies and the proposed models would have to the project budget and time-scales. CNS held many discussions with the co-ordinator in this respect. CNS produced the second and third project report and submitted it to SBB for quality acceptance.

JRS reported administration of the document store and the mailing list - specifically for the observing partners.

RA held internal management and contacts with their administrative division.

SBB undertook quality assurance and acceptance of the management deliverables. SBB also reported negotiations with partners about the necessity of a project budget transfer, intensive discussions with all partners about fundamental decisions required regarding the general LEAF model, quality assurance and acceptance of the third project report and communication with project partners and the European Commission concerning clarifications regarding the first cost claims.

Task 1.3: Meetings

All partners with the exception of GSA attended the Caen Working Group Meeting on 27, 28 September 2001.

CNS, FDÖP and IMEC reported reading and provision of comments to the Graz Working Group Meeting of 19th and 20th November 2001.

SBB, JRS, CNS, ÖNB, UCM, UoB and RA attended the Graz Working Group Meeting.

BL arranged and held a series of Partnerships & Co-operations meetings in London with SBB and Crossnet.

CNS reported preparation and presentations at the Caen Working Group Meeting and Working Group Meeting in Graz on 19, 20 November 2001.

SBB reported preparation of and participation in the Caen Working Group Meeting. SBB also prepared the minutes of the Caen Working Group Meeting, including the summaries of individual working groups' results.

SBB undertook a working visit to the BL (22.-26.10.2001), and held meetings with various members of staff and management at the BL in order to raise awareness of the LEAF project; both within and outside the Department of Manuscripts. In addition, SBB had a meeting with Dick Sargant of the National Register of Archives and David Sutton of the National Location Register Project to discuss possibilities of co-operation. SBB prepared a report about the visit to the BL for project partners.

SBB reported preparation of the Working Group Meeting in Graz; Austria (19.-20.11.2001).

SBB reported participation and report about LEAF in a meeting of the PND (German authority file of personal names) working group at the Deutsche Bibliothek, Frankfurt / Main, 5.-7.12.2001.

SBB reported the preparation of the LEAF plenary meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4.-5. April 2002.

SBB reported participation in a meeting in Marbach, 05.-08.02.2002, where aspects of the integration of KALLIAS and KALLIOPE into LEAF were discussed with DLA.

SBB reported a meeting with representatives of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Hannover, 20.02.2002: Discussion of KALLIOPE matters under consideration of LEAF.

UCM reported attendance at the Working Group Meetings in Caen and Graz.

UoB reported planning and participating and reporting the Working Group Meeting in Caen.

UoB reported planning for the participation at the "EC/NSF DL All Projects" meeting (Rome, March 2002) and the LEAF plenary meeting in Ljubljana (April).

Task 1.4: Final report

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

3.1.3 WP 1 – Output

First cost claim.

Project Report 2 and 3.

Management Report 1.

Minutes of the Caen Working Group Meeting.

Minutes of the Graz Working Group Meeting.

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 provided various minor updates to the project web site. CNS generated a template for the project newsletter and various formats for the project newsletter for discussion by partners. CNS also reported liaison with SBB regarding the technical operations concerning the LEAF web domain name.

IMEC reported consultation and comments on the web site.

ÖNB provided input for the project web site in terms of metadata for the HTML code of the LEAF website for the robots of the search engines and Dublin Core metadata.

SBB prepared a document about the project web site (D 2.1. Project Presentation), and undertook a quality check of the project web site's contents and various quality assurance activities on changes made to the web site.

Task 2.2 Dissemination of results

BN undertook various presentations of LEAF at local workshops and at various national events.

CNS reported discussing LEAF with attendees at the user conference of their sister company DS Ltd. at their CALM archive product user conference at the Royal Society, Feb 19th 2002.

DLA proof read the Dissemination and Use Plan. DLA presented the LEAF model to their own manuscript department.

DLA prepared and held a presentation: "Kallias in the context of MALVINE and LEAF" at the ICLA (International Council of Literary Archives) meeting in Marbach.

IMEC undertook dissemination of the project to IMEC's partners.

NUK and UCM provided information about the project on their web sites.

ÖNB reported preparation and presentation of a LEAF Presentation at the **AG** Normdateien (Authority Files Working Group). ÖNB also reported writing a paper on LEAF for "Sichtungen", and the preparation and presentation of LEAF at Vienna University Library.

RA attended a conference on archival standards for Belgian archivists at Brussels on 3 October. RA prepared a newsletter article for a conference of Polish archivists 27-28 October. RA reported providing information about LEAF to the project "Image Databases and Digitisation - platform for ALM collaboration" (Royal Library, Stockholm).

SBB reported:

- preparation and finalisation of version 1.0 of the Dissemination and Use Plan,
- preparation of a database containing names and e-mail addresses of the subscribers of the Newsletter,
- preparation of an article for the first LEAF Newsletter,
- preparation of the first LEAF Newsletter,
- preparation of a visit to Rome, Italy, to attend the "EC/NSF DL All Projects" meeting and presentation of LEAF, on March 25-26, 2002,
- preparation of a visit to Den Haag, Netherlands, and presentation of LEAF at the European Social Science History Conference, February 28, 2002,
- presentation of LEAF at the "Landesmuseum für Technik und Arbeit", Mannheim, 26.-27.02.2002.

UoB reported dissemination on LEAF among colleagues at UoB and at a national level. This included writing an article about LEAF in a national library periodical.

3.2.3 WP 2 – Output

Revised pages for the LEAF web site.

Dissemination and Use Plan (D 2.2).

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

BN undertook an analysis and revision of the local scenarios and metadata descriptions.

IMEC undertook an analysis of existing metadata formats.

JRS undertook a review and provided comments regarding metadata information.

ÖNB undertook an analysis of metadata including the preparation of LEAF metadata tables.

SBB undertook further work on a draft version of an accumulated metadata profile for the description of corporate bodies. SBB undertook finalisation of the LEAF Metadata Tables Document.

Task 3.3: Partnerships and Cooperations

BL arranged and held a series of Partnerships & Co-operations meetings in London with NRA and the National Location Register Project.

BN reported various relevant contacts with DELOS, DCMI etc.

IMEC reported co-operation with a new observing partner.

RA reported information of the "The Committee for Descriptive Standards of the International Council of Archives".

SBB reported co-operation and communication with the CERL consortium.

UCM proposed the addition of a new observing partner.

UoB reported co-operation with the EAD and ISAAR communities and co-operation initiatives at a national level.

3.3.3 WP 3 – Output

LEAF Metadata Tables Document.

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

DLA developed and refined a sample data export script for authority records of corporate bodies. DLA contributed several revisions of local metadata documentation and sample data for corporate bodies.

GSA reported verification of metadata tables.

IMEC reported analysis of XML formats related to the project.

ÖNB reported preparation of input material for the EAC conversion.

UCM undertook a data extraction from the UCM system for further conversion to potential LEAF formats.

UoB reported work on the recommended name DTD, including delivery of the final version of this document.

UoB reported collecting additional information and test data from data providers in order to start the work on the conversion tools.

UoB undertook a study of the MALVINE conversion scripts to evaluate this method for use in the LEAF project.

UoB undertook the development of a first version of a conversion script from MARC21 Authorities to the EAC DTD and the testing of this.

3.4.3 WP 4 – Output

Recommended Name DTD Report (D 4.1).

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

ÖNB, JRS, SNL and SBB reported provision of input, commenting and checking of the MRAD-1 document.

BN reported contributions to the Model Requirements discussions.

CNS reported considerable discussions of the LEAF model - preparing of rationale and arguments to the differences being raised between the original model in the contract and the model presented by BN to the meeting in Berlin, 23-24 August 2001.

CNS reported consolidation of the MRAD-1 document.

DLA took part in the discussion of the LEAF model via the mailing list and at the Caen Working Group Meeting. DLA contributed to the MRAD draft versions and the proposals for the Working Group “Integration of MALVINE-LEAF”.

DLA reported preparation and upload of a technical description of Kallías' Token Export Format.

FDÖP participated in the discussion of the LEAF model and delivered input to the MRAD-1 (detailed description of the local scenario at FDÖP: status of the FDÖP authority file; updating procedures and technical aspects of data provision and contractual matters).

JRS participated in the discussion of the LEAF model at the Working Group Meeting in Graz.

JRS reported discussions of the LEAF model and of the proposed changes' implications for the system development.

NUK provided identification and definition of model user scenarios. NUK undertook an analysis and evaluation of their authority file data against the objectives of LEAF.

ÖNB undertook an analysis of the LEAF Model and prepared input for the MRAD-1.

RA participated in the debate about the LEAF model.

SBB organised various project internal working groups dealing with different aspects of the LEAF model. SBB undertook proof reading and commenting to the MRAD-1.

SNL undertook metadata mapping, reading reports and discussion of the LEAF model.

UCM undertook preparation of the activities in WG2 “Linking system: functionalities and parameters” during the Graz Working Group Meeting.

Task 5.1.2: Definition of User Groups

BN contributed to MRAD-2.

NUK provided identification and definition of possible user groups, including user scenario models for various user groups like archives, libraries, etc.

ÖNB undertook an analysis of user scenarios, providing input for WG3 "Annotations system", and input for LEAF WG2, "Linking system: functionalities and parameters" and WG6 "Presentation of results".

ÖNB prepared input for and attended the LEAF Working Group Meeting in Graz.

SBB reported discussion of the LEAF model according to partner and user group needs.

SBB and ÖNB reported preparation of drafts of the MRAD-2 document.

SNL reported studying of the MRAD-2 drafts.

Task 5.1.3: User Survey

BN reported analysis and dissemination of the user survey.

CNS reported supervision of the project web site including the testing of the user form and of the operations of the web questionnaire in the context of the LEAF user survey. CNS extracted the mySQL database containing the survey results and sent them to SBB and ÖNB.

IMEC reported some testing of the web user questionnaire.

NUK provided definitions of user needs at different levels for libraries and archives. NUK prepared the installation of their database under consideration of the LEAF model discussion and provided relevant samples. NUK undertook construction of the bibliographic NUK metadata document for manuscripts.

ÖNB reported analysis of the user survey results.

SBB worked closely with ÖNB regarding the processing and the evaluation of the results of the user survey. SBB worked on the MRAD-3.

SNL reported studying and comments to the MRAD-3 document.

Task 5.1.4: Identification of Services

NUK reported identification and definition of services to be provided to the defined user groups.

NUK reported definition of user groups in connection with search fields and interfaces.

UCM provided drafts of MRAD-4.

UoB provided various comments to the MRAD-4 document.

3.5.3 WP 5.1 – Output

Various draft technical notes were produced within the Working Groups, being intended as input for the deliverables.

Various drafts of the MRAD.

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

ÖNB, RA, SNL, UCM and SBB undertook an analysis of practice and background studies and collection of material.

BL reported contributions to the Model Requirements discussions (monitoring, assessing and contributing towards discussions relating to the proposed model) and focussing on a questionnaire from RA.

BN provided various data relating the state of the art in related initiatives.

BN reported identification of partnerships: contacts and exploitation of collaboration opportunities with TEL, DELOS and DCMI (WG on agents in digital libraries).

CNS participated in various discussions about how the LEAF model is focussed to project data providers.

DLA contributed an updated description of their local system, local policy documents for authority file usage, statistical analysis of record details and specific sample data for the "analysis of practice" document in WP 5.2.3 prepared by RA. On February 6-7th, DLA held a meeting with Jutta Weber of SBB in Marbach to further discuss the practice regarding authority files in the context of German national authority files (PND, GKD, SWD), SBB/ZKA and DLA and MALVINE/LEAF. This included focus on DLA's actual LEAF contribution during the future test period, including local financial details and time schedule. Staff members of the library, the manuscripts department, the IT group, the management and the local working group for quality assurance of authority files participated in this meeting.

FDÖP prepared an analysis of their actual practice regarding name authority information and data structures.

NUK undertook investigation of their authority file and bibliographic database with respect to an analysis of the database functions and a study of different standards and data formats used.

ÖNB undertook an analysis of possible partnerships.

RA and UoB undertook an analysis and studies of the current status quo in this area.

RA and UoB undertook preparations for an analysis of various ways of practice in this area.

UoB had various email discussions and undertook report evaluations regarding the analysis of practice.

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

IMEC reported analysis of the EAC DTD related to the project.

JRS reported preparation of the system architecture according to the modified LEAF model; prototyping for database and web user interface, work on deliverables ADD, ICD and Coverage Matrix.

NUK reported the investigation of NUK's database technology with a view on making it useful in the context of the components of the overall LEAF system architecture.

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	1388.0	98.5	187.8	132.0	133.5	474.0	177.0	84.0	162.0	140.5	330.0	337.0	232.0	148.5	195.0
Remaining	2250.3	171.0	232.2	148.0	194.6	576.0	173.0	222.3	157.4	164.0	-1.9	-9.8	20.0	131.5	133.1
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	9.8	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	473.0	10.0	63.0	10.0	27.5	292.0	207.0	52.5	24.0	2.5	53.0	115.0	0.0	0.0	56.0
Remaining	200.8	57.4	77.0	60.0	497.5	364.3	353.0	8.8	742.5	73.6	209.5	277.7	63.0	70.0	9.6
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	414.0		65.3		222.0	0.0	196.0	182.0	26.0		200.0	59.0			116.0
Remaining	394.5		74.7		237.4	328.1	434.0	246.8	37.9		-134.4	6.5			146.5
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	66.5	0.0	0.0	881.5		56.0	0.0	60.0	0.8	0.0	95.0	0.0	10.0	36.0
Remaining	469.0	0.9	70.0	70.0	1743.5		224.0	245.0	195.5	75.4	262.5	166.8	63.0	60.0	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	1632.0	135.0	453.5	124.0	6.5	389.0	1049.0	630.0	88.0	51.0	262.0	50.0	80.0	20.0	27.0
Remaining	-284.5	-67.6	-173.5	-54.0	256.0	-126.5	-209.0	-140.0	-24.1	25.1	0.5	15.5	-17.0	50.0	235.5
Overrun	284.5	67.6	173.5	54.0	0.0	126.5	209.0	140.0	24.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	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	11.0	100.0	57.0	55.0	15.0	96.0	160.0	220.0	32.0	0.5	135.0	7.0	0.0	12.0	88.0
Remaining	797.5	-32.6	223.0	15.0	50.6	-30.4	470.0	760.0	31.9	75.6	258.8	58.5	63.0	58.0	437.0
Overrun	0.0	32.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.4	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		588.3		79.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	49.0			0.0
Remaining	134.8		811.8		52.3	131.3	140.0	122.5	127.8	76.1	111.3	81.9			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	4219.8	48.1
2 Dissemination & Concertation	4450.1	829.5	18.6
3 Standards Representation	3252.2	1001.0	30.8
4 Data Representation Study	5147.8	1139.3	22.1
5.1 Model Requirements Analysis	4483.3	2652.5	59.2
5.2 Focus the Model	4224.3	765.5	18.1
6 Functional Spec of Demonstrator	2657.0	148.0	5.6
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	10755.5	18.7

Totals by Partner		
Partner	Total Budget (hours)	Budget Used to Date (hours)
SBB	9769	3988
DLA	1550	410
JRS	7700	1415
FDÖP	1610	321
UoB	6366	1365
CNS	4463	1251
ÖNB	5950	1845
BN	3675	1169
UCM	2747	392
SNL	1523	195
NUK	3478	1000
IMEC	2422	712
BL	1323	312
GSA	1610	191
RA	3347	518

