



## LEAF - Linking and Exploring Authority Files

IST-2000-26323

---

### Progress Report 3

DATE 20.11.2002

AUTHOR Ulrike Beermann

QUALITY ASSURANCE Jutta Weber

WORK PACKAGE WP 1, Task 1.1

KEYWORDS Progress Report - Number 3

DELIVERABLE NUMBER D 1.1-PROGRESS\_REP-3

#### DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Comments	Status	Distribution
0.1	20.11.2002	Third Progress Report	Draft	SBB's LEAF team
1.0	20.11.2002	Final Version	Final Version	All project personnel and the European Commission

## Table of Contents

<b><u>Table of Contents</u></b>	<b>2</b>
<b><u>1.1 Scope</u></b> .....	4
<b><u>1.2 Reporting Procedures</u></b> .....	4
<b><u>1.3 Partner Acronyms and Abbreviations</u></b> .....	4
<b><u>2 Summary of Activities in this Reporting Period</u></b>	<b>6</b>
<b><u>3 Details of Activities in this Reporting Period</u></b>	<b>8</b>
<b><u>3.1 WP 1 - Management and Administration Management</u></b> .....	<b>8</b>
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
<b><u>3.2 WP 2 - Dissemination and Concertation</u></b> .....	<b>10</b>
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> .....	12
<b><u>3.3 WP 3 - Standards Representation</u></b> .....	<b>12</b>
3.3.1 <u>WP 3 – Events</u> .....	12
3.3.2 <u>WP 3 – Activities</u> .....	12
3.3.3 <u>WP 3 – Output</u> .....	13
<b><u>3.4 WP 4 - Data Representation Study</u></b> .....	<b>13</b>
3.4.1 <u>WP 4 – Events</u> .....	13
3.4.2 <u>WP 4 – Activities</u> .....	13
3.4.3 <u>WP 4 – Output</u> .....	13
<b><u>3.5 WP 5.1 - Model requirements analysis</u></b> .....	<b>13</b>
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
<b><u>3.6 WP 5.2 - Focussing the model with authority file data</u></b> .....	<b>14</b>
3.6.1 <u>WP 5.2 – Events</u> .....	14
3.6.2 <u>WP 5.2 – Activities</u> .....	14
3.6.3 <u>WP 5.2 – Output</u> .....	15
<b><u>3.7 WP 6 - Functional Specifications of the Demonstrator</u></b> .....	<b>15</b>
3.7.1 <u>WP 6 – Events</u> .....	15
3.7.2 <u>WP 6 – Activities</u> .....	15
3.7.3 <u>WP 6 – Output</u> .....	16
<b><u>3.8 WP 7 - System Development and Preparation of Test Environment</u></b> .....	<b>16</b>
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
<b><u>3.9 WP 8 - Test of the Demonstrator</u></b> .....	<b>17</b>
3.9.1 <u>WP 8 – Events</u> .....	17
3.9.2 <u>WP 8 – Activities</u> .....	17
3.9.3 <u>WP 8 – Output</u> .....	17

<b><u>3.10</u></b>	<b><u>WP 9 - Model compatibility/ maintenance suite</u></b>	<b>17</b>
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
<b><u>3.11</u></b>	<b><u>WP 10 - Assessment and Evaluation</u></b>	<b>17</b>
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
<b><u>3.12</u></b>	<b><u>WP 11 - Technical Implementation Plan (Exploitation Planning)</u></b>	<b>17</b>
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>	18
<b><u>4</u></b>	<b><u>Project Activities by Recorded Time</u></b>	<b>19</b>

## Introduction

### 1.1 Scope

This document is the Progress Report number 3 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 13-18 (March-August 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.

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

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

<b>ADD</b>	Architectural Design Document
<b>AMARC</b>	Association for Manuscripts and Archives in Research Collections,

- <http://www.manuscripts.org.uk/amarc/header.htm>
- DTD** Document Type Description
- EAC** Encoded Archival Context, <http://www.library.yale.edu/eac>
- EAD** Encoded Archival Description, <http://www.loc.gov/ead/>
- EC** European Commission
- EC/NSF DL** European Commission/National Science Foundation Digital Libraries, <http://www.nsf.gov/home/int/europe/index.htm>
- FRANAR** Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records,
- HANS** Handschriften, Autographen, Nachlässe und Sonderbestände, <http://www.sub.uni-hamburg.de/informationen/projekte/hans/hans.htm>
- ICA** International Council on Archives, <http://www.ica.org/>
- ICD** Interface Control Document
- IFLA** International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, <http://www.ifla.org/>
- ISAAR** International Standard Archival Authority Record, <http://www.ica.org/biblio/com/cds/isaare.html>
- IT** Information Technology
- LEAF** Linking and Exploring Authority Files, <http://www.leaf-eu.org>
- LIBER** Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche, <http://www.kb.dk/liber/>
- MALVINE** Manuscripts and Letters Via Integrated Networks in Europe, <http://www.malvine.org>
- MARD** Model Application Requirements Document
- MRAD** Model Requirements Analysis Document
- NIBB** Normativna in bibliografska baza (i.e. NUK's Authority and bibliographic database for manuscripts)
- NRA** National Register of Archives, <http://www.hmc.gov.uk/nra/nra2.htm>
- OCLC** Online Computer Library Center, <http://www.oclc.org/home/>
- QA** Quality Assurance
- RLG** Research Libraries Group, <http://www.rlg.org/toc.html>
- TEL** The European Library, <http://www.europeanlibrary.org>
- VIAF** Virtual International Authority File, <http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/viaf/index.shtm>
- WG** Working Group
- WP** Work Package
- XML** Extensible Markup Language, <http://www.w3.org/XML/>

## 2 Summary of Activities in this Reporting Period

This report is produced after one half of the entire project duration. As the second half of this reporting period was during the summer vacation period, some partners did not undertake any work on the project.

The project team have consolidated on the design and requirements and have agreed on the model and a realistic solution to the requirements. It was evident that some confusion remained between partners after the previous difficult design period, but these aspects were being clarified. Most of the confusion was associated to the links in the model – when these would be created, if they would have unique IDs, and a period of constructive discussion has occurred.

The period started with the first annual Plenary Meeting held at NUK in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4-5 April 2002. Our hosts provided excellent facilities for the meeting which was very positive and constructive. Many minor details were clarified through a series of presentations, and this also included initial thoughts on the WPs and Tasks that had not yet started, but were due to start in the forthcoming months.

The amount of effort in the system model requirements is reflected by the amount of work recorded in WP 5.1. Whilst the total budget has not been exceeded in that WP, several partners who are particularly active in this WP have gone over budget. This is acceptable to the project because the design and requirements form the basis to which subsequent activities will follow.

It was also interesting at the Plenary meeting to see initial screen designs of the system user interface, and to see how the various software interfaces will fit together.

After the Ljubljana meeting the project team have continued to consolidate the design and requirements and this was discussed at a technical meeting in Berlin on 29-30 August 2002. It was generally considered that the prepared prototype screens were too many and too complicated for navigation, and these were simplified to meet the expectations of users. At this stage, screens were very plain in design – ie, no cosmetics applied. The screen prototype designs were now used as input to the system development.

With the model requirements more or less finalised, partners are now assessing their own systems for data supply and conversion, this being consolidated with the work in the Data Representation Study.

In addition, with the requirements and design starting to finalise, CNS is now commencing their model and compatibility/maintenance suite work in WP9.

Partners continue to undertake dissemination and concertation activities, and SBB, CNS, ÖNB and SNL attended the week-long IFLA event held at Glasgow from 18-24 August 2002. CNS attended also as an exhibitor. SBB and CNS gave a joint presentation on the Commission exhibition stand – mainly about MALVINE but also mentioning LEAF.

Analysis of the recorded time shows that some partners are still using their budget in WP 1 at a far higher rate than originally envisaged. As mentioned above, this also applies to WP 5.1 – but this is not surprising given the amount of discussion this WP has required. The project budget was discussed at the Ljubljana plenary meeting and it was ascertained that certain budget transfers would need to be made. When discussing this issue with the Project Officer it was identified that ideally any transfers should be below the 20% figure to avoid contractual changes. The proposed budget transfers have now been submitted to the Commission for approval.

The first half of this period ended on an extremely positive note with the Peer Review held at Luxembourg on May 28. This was attended by SBB, CNS, JRS and UoB, and several excellent presentations were given to the EC and the reviewers. The review also had a very constructive session of questions and answers, and

the project received excellent review feedback, with the reviewers raising some constructive ideas for the forthcoming activities.

In summary, this was still a very busy period for the project despite the summer holiday season, and the project continues at a good pace.

## 3 Details of Activities in this Reporting Period

### 3.1 WP 1 - Management and Administration Management

#### 3.1.1 WP 1 – Events

A project plenary meeting was held at NUK in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4-5 April 2002.

The project received its first peer review in Luxembourg on 28 May 2002.

A technical meeting took place in Berlin on the 29-30 August 2002.

#### 3.1.2 WP 1 – Activities

##### Task 1.1: Administration Management

All partners reported general administration, local management and submission of information for their reports.

CNS undertook several discussions with the project coordinator regarding the budget and possible budget transfers. CNS made some minor updates to the project management documents and reported QA of some of the project deliverables.

JRS reported finalisation of their part of the planned budget transfer.

SBB reported:

- consultations with the project manager regarding the general progress of the project,
- administration of all observing partners' needs,
- contact to a new observing partner,
- preparation of the first Public Progress Report,
- organization of the project's document store, and,
- preparation of copies of the signed LEAF Consortium Agreement to be sent to the partners, and dissemination of these copies.

SNL reported correspondence with their national funding body.

##### Task 1.2 Project Management

CNS, FDÖP, JRS, RA and SBB reported project management and planning activities.

CNS produced the fourth project report and submitted it to SBB for quality acceptance. CNS provided advice for cost claim processing. CNS provided extensive management input in planning for the peer review. CNS produced a preparatory draft of the fifth project report and contacted several partners who were very late in submitting their reports.

JRS reported administration of the document store and the mailing list and internal resource and task planning.

RA held internal management and contacts with their administrative division.

SBB reported:

- preparation of a project budget transfer including communication with the European Commission about it,
- coordination of the second cost claims and communication with project partners and the European Commission concerning clarifications thereof,
- quality assurance and acceptance of Project Report 4,
- preparation of the second Progress Report.

### **Task 1.3: Meetings**

All partners with the exception of GSA reported attendance of the plenary meeting at NUK in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4-5 April 2002.

SBB, JRS, UoB and CNS reported preparation of and attendance to the peer review meeting in Luxembourg.

SBB, UoB, RA, ÖNB and JRS reported preparation of and participation in the Berlin Technical Meeting (29.-30.08.2002).

CNS reported reading and providing comments to the minutes of the plenary meeting.

SBB reported:

- preparation of the LEAF Plenary Meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 4-5 April 2002, including the provision of draft and a final version(s) of an agenda,
- preparation of the plenary meeting draft and final minutes,
- preparation of a task meeting with ÖNB and the observing partner City Library of Vienna.

UoB reported planning and participation of the Plenary meeting.

### **Task 1.4: Final report**

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

#### **3.1.3 WP 1 – Output**

Project Report 4.

Agenda of plenary meeting.

Draft and final minutes of plenary meeting.

Peer review presentations.

Draft of Project Report 5.

## 3.2 WP 2 - Dissemination and Concertation

### 3.2.1 WP 2 – Events

The IFLA event took place in Glasgow in August 2002. SBB, CNS, SNL and ÖNB attended and regularly attended the Commission's stand to discuss LEAF and MALVINE to interested persons.

### 3.2.2 WP 2 – Activities

#### Task 2.1: Creation and Administration of the Project Website

CNS undertook supervision of the project web site, and prepared the templates of the pages that were to be in other languages. CNS collated the text of the web site and circulated it to partners for translation. CNS liaised with SBB regarding the network routing and access concerning the LEAF.ORG URL. CNS reported finalisation of the LEAF newsletter. CNS reported continuing the supervision of the project web site and continued to add the pages that were in other languages and finally making these go live.

IMEC reported consultation and comments on the website, and submissions of translations to French to CNS.

RA reported translation of the project web pages to Swedish.

SBB provided the initial translation of the website to German. ÖNB, JRS, SBB, FDÖP and GSA provided comments to the translation thereafter.

Furthermore, SBB reported:

- discussions with CNS and IT-staff at SBB about the technical framework of the LEAF website, and performed further quality checks of the project website's contents,
- further input to and proof reading of the LEAF Website, and,
- further updates of the project website.

SNL provided updates to their web site pages describing the project.

UCM reported translation of the project web pages to Spanish.

UoB reported translation of the project web pages to Norwegian.

#### Task 2.2 Dissemination of results

BL undertook dissemination of LEAF by the preparation of a power-point presentation and talk at the FRANAR meeting.

BN reported local dissemination of the LEAF project.

CNS reported the preparation and distribution of the first LEAF Newsletter.

FDÖP reported finalizing an article about LEAF for the FDÖP yearbook "Nachrichten" and preparation of a LEAF presentation for the FDÖP website.

IMEC undertook dissemination of the project to the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and reported dissemination of the project to IMEC's partners.

JRS reported giving a presentation in Vienna at Nationaler Informationstag "Der Übergang vom 5. zum 6. Rahmenprogramm und das kulturelle Erbe" <http://www.ciscaustria.at/events/eu0009.htm>.

ÖNB wrote a paper on LEAF for "Sichtungen" and attended Literaturarchivtagung 2002, Vienna, where a presentation of LEAF was given. ÖNB provided contributions to and checking of the LEAF Newsletter. ÖNB reported preparation of and attending a LEAF-presentation at the CULTIVATE Workshop, Vienna. ÖNB provided updates to their LEAF-Webpage. Furthermore, ÖNB reported preparation of German LEAF leaflets for dissemination at conferences and attended the IFLA Conference in Glasgow, presenting LEAF and contacting relevant initiatives and institutions.

SBB reported:

- update of the project information on the SBB website,
- preparation of the first LEAF Newsletter, and writing an article for the first issue of the LEAF Newsletter, and proof-reading of other contributions to the first issue of the LEAF Newsletter,
- participation in the HANS-Anwendertreffen 2002, report about Kalliope and LEAF, 14.03.2002,
- participation at a round table about authority data in Mannheim, "Landesmuseum für Technik und Arbeit", presentation of LEAF, 19.03.2002,
- proofreading of an article of RA "Archival Context Information and Authority Records" to be provided at the project website and in the observer section on the document store,
- presentation of LEAF at the Deutscher Bibliothekartag, Augsburg, Germany, 09.-12.04.2002,
- participation in the RLG annual meeting, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 22.-23.04.2002, and presentation of LEAF,
- participation in the annual meeting of literary archives in Vienna, Austria, 25.-26.04.2002, and presentation of Kalliope (with regard to LEAF),
- participation in the TEL workshop, Frankfurt/Main, Germany, 30.04.2002, and presentation of LEAF,
- preparation of a first version of the "Dissemination Document" (D2.3),
- preparation of an updated "Dissemination Document" (D2.3),
- contribution to an ÖNB publication about LEAF in the journal "Sichtungen",
- preparation of an article about LEAF for the British Society of Archivists Newsletter,
- dissemination of project results to a group of visiting French librarians at SBB,
- preparation of an article about LEAF for the British AMARC Newsletter (Association for Manuscripts and Archives in Research Collections),
- the preparation of and participation in the "EC/NSF DL All Projects Meeting", Rome 25.-26.3.2002, including a presentation of LEAF,
- presentation of LEAF at the 68th IFLA General Conference and Council (18-24/08/2002) in Glasgow, 19/08/2002, and prior preparation of the presentation, and,
- preparation of a joint article (with P-G Ottosson of Riksarkivet, Stockholm) for the "Society of Archivists Newsletter".

SNL undertook the preparation of a LEAF presentation and the updating of SNL web pages.

UoB reported checking the Norwegian LEAF Web pages and explaining the LEAF project goals and principles to interested researchers.

### 3.2.3 WP 2 – Output

Revised pages for the LEAF web site.

The first LEAF Newsletter.

Dissemination Document D2.3.

Various project presentations.

## 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 reported undertaking a revision of the local scenarios and metadata descriptions.

#### Task 3.3: Partnerships and Cooperations

BN reported various partnerships and co-operations (work done in coordination with Tasks 5.2.1 and 5.2.2).

ÖNB reported attending the EC/NSF DL All Projects Meeting in Rome, and undertaking an analysis of the FRANAR model and analysis of various name authority initiatives. Furthermore, ÖNB reported attending the IFLA Conference in Glasgow and presenting LEAF and contacting relevant initiatives and institutions.

RA reported meetings and exchange of information with representatives of other projects: EU project Minerva, and ICA/Committee for Descriptive Standards.

SBB reported:

- discussions with BL and the observing partner “INTERPARTY” about a liaison with the FRANAR working group,
- liaison activities regarding INTERPARTY, FRANAR and NRA,
- discussions with observing partner OCLC about the VIAF project, and,
- discussions with observing partner NRA about actual forms of cooperation.

UoB reported cooperation with the standardization body for EAD (ISAAR).

### 3.3.3 WP 3 – Output

Various presentations.

## 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

FDÖP provided test data for UoB.

IMEC reported analysis of XML formats related to the project. IMEC reported undertaking an analysis and preparation of foreseen local formats and their suitability to the LEAF format.

NUK reported analysis of their system export format and undertaking a survey of database structures regarding metadata.

ÖNB prepared for input and EAC conversion.

RA reported testing and documentation of the EAC DTD.

SNL provided new samples of their data in XML format.

UoB reported collection of test data from those data providers who had not previously provided data and work on the conversion tools. UoB reported testing of the DTD against different local formats. UoB provided a report on the LEAF encoding practice.

### 3.4.3 WP 4 – Output

A revised draft report about the LEAF encoding practice.

## 3.5 WP 5.1 - Model requirements analysis

### 3.5.1 WP 5.1 – Events

There were no events for this task in the reporting period.

### 3.5.2 WP 5.1 – Activities

#### Task 5.1.1: Analysis of input data

BN reported revision and consolidation of MRAD-1.

CNS reported having considerable discussions to the LEAF model - preparing of rationale and arguments to the differences being raised between the original model in the contract and the model as discussed at Graz. This included a thorough analysis and reading of MRAD documents.

GSA reported reading the MRAD documents.

SBB undertook further corrections to the third draft version of MRAD-1.

### **Task 5.1.2: Definition of User Groups**

SBB provided another update and a final version of MRAD-2 including harmonization of all parts of the MRAD documentation. SBB reported additional discussions and revisions of both the LEAF model and corresponding system requirements as formulated in MRAD-2.

### **Task 5.1.3: User Survey**

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

### **Task 5.1.4: Identification of Services**

UoB reported various email discussions and report evaluations.

### **3.5.3 WP 5.1 – Output**

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

Further drafts of the MRAD deliverables and the final versions of the MRAD deliverables.

## **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**

#### **Task 5.2.1: Status Quo Analysis**

BN reported assessing the state of the art in related initiatives (work done in coordination with Task 3.3).

CNS reported reading various draft documentation of this WP.

IMEC reported an analysis of the adaptation of French authority files.

SBB reported discussions with BN about the scope of MARD-1.

#### **Task 5.2.2: Identification of Partnerships**

BN reported identification of partnerships (work done in coordination with Task 3.3).

ÖNB reported preparation of MARD-2, attending the LIBER Conference in Graz, and contacting relevant initiatives and institutions.

SBB reported cooperation with BL regarding the liaison with the National Register of Archives and discussions with ÖNB about the scope of MARD-2.

#### **Task 5.2.3: Analysis of Practice**

BN reported an analysis of practices.

CNS reported discussions and comments to how the LEAF model is focussed to project data providers.

DLA reported continuation of the analysis of practices regarding authority files between SBB, DLA and LEAF, and finalised the minutes of the DLA/SBB meeting in February 2002.

JRS reported identification of transmission protocols for upload and update procedures, held discussions of the model details, and work on linking procedures.

NUK reported an analysis of user requirements and adequate adjustment of interface, database improvement, and internal testing of their database.

ÖNB prepared input for MARD-3 and undertook an analysis of practice. Furthermore, ÖNB attended an allegro-HANS-Meeting at Frankfurt/Main and undertook an analysis of practice of the HANS user community.

RA reported undertaking an analysis of practice.

SBB reported discussions with RA about the scope of MARD-3 and proofreading and providing comments to a first draft version of MARD-3.

SNL reported studying, adding information and commenting to MARD-3.

UCM reported provision of name authority information and data structure from the UCM system.

UoB reported various information collection activities.

#### **Task 5.2.4: Identification of System Requirements**

BN reported undertaking identification of system requirements (analysis of the requirements for the BN structure imposed by the MRAD conclusions).

JRS reported discussions of the model details and how the requirements work in practice.

NUK reported preparation and installation of the NIBB (NUK database) export program.

RA reported participation in the "prototype working group".

SBB reported preliminary work on MARD-4.

#### **3.6.3 WP 5.2 – Output**

Various drafts of MARD documentation.

### **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**

BN reported the provision of functional specifications of the demonstrator (work done in coordination with Task 5.2.4).

CNS reported reading the draft documentation produced by JRS and assessing the design and interface requirements of the maintenance suite.

IMEC undertook an analysis of interfaces used in the project.

JRS undertook a revision of the first architecture, prototyping for database and web user interface, and provided further input for deliverables ADD, ICD and cross-reference with the 1<sup>st</sup> revision of the architecture. JRS ascertained a strategy for technologies to be used.

NUK undertook identification and verification of NUK technology that can be used as the components of the overall system architecture, including a comparison and definition of interface and selection of standards. NUK undertook improvement of the interface to their database.

SBB reported undertaking a detailed study of the LEAF prototype and providing input to the Prototype Working Group and provision of discussion papers.

SNL reported studying and commenting to the prototype design.

UoB held various e-mail discussions and report evaluations.

### **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**

CNS reported the preparation and selection of suitable hardware and software technologies for the development and operations of the maintenance suite.

DLA reported the analysis and discussion of various aspects of the overall system design as presented in Ljubljana.

FDÖP started preparation work on a first sample of their test-data for the test environment.

JRS undertook an investigation of technologies (frameworks, database and application server) and provided an update to the web user interface prototype. JRS reported the installation of the basic server setting, investigation on technologies (test of publishing/workflow framework), and work on linking procedures. JRS reported installation of the ORACLE environment on their test machine.

ÖNB reported preparing input for the design of the LEAF user interface and for the WG demonstrator prototype. ÖNB also reported preparing input for the Berlin technical meeting and attendance to the Berlin technical meeting.

UoB reported work on conversion tools, including a style-sheet for the presentation of authority information.

### **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**

CNS undertook the initial design and development of the model compatibility/maintenance suite.

### **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
<b>1 Mgmt. &amp; Admin Mgmt.</b>															
Budgeted hours	3638	270	420	280	328	1050	350	306	319	305	328	327	252	280	328
Booked to date	2324.0	100.0	215.8	178.0	360.0	691.0	242.0	119.0	275.0	182.0	330.0	337.0	264.0	170.5	255.0
Remaining	1314.3	169.5	204.2	102.0	-31.9	359.0	108.0	187.3	44.4	122.5	-1.9	-9.8	-12.0	109.5	73.1
Overrun	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	9.8	12.0	0.0	0.0
<b>2 Dissemination &amp; Concertation</b>															
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	1036.0	10.0	74.0	30.0	38.5	448.5	320.0	66.5	194.0	4.5	108.0	258.0	12.0	2.0	60.0
Remaining	-362.3	57.4	66.0	40.0	486.5	207.8	240.0	-5.3	572.5	71.6	154.5	134.7	51.0	68.0	5.6
Overrun	362.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>3 Standards Representation</b>															
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	485.0		65.3		242.0	0.0	307.0	308.0	26.0		200.0	59.0			128.0
Remaining	323.5		74.7		217.4	328.1	323.0	120.8	37.9		-134.4	6.5			134.5
Overrun	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		134.4	0.0			0.0
<b>4 Data Representation Study</b>															
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	35.0	1105.5		160.0	0.0	60.0	1.8	108.0	172.0	0.0	10.0	48.0
Remaining	469.0	0.9	70.0	35.0	1519.5		120.0	245.0	195.5	74.4	154.5	89.8	63.0	60.0	214.5
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
<b>5.1 Model Requirements Analysis</b>															
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	1742.0	135.0	453.5	124.0	12.0	413.0	1049.0	830.0	88.0	51.0	262.0	50.0	80.0	26.0	27.0
Remaining	-394.5	-67.6	-173.5	-54.0	250.5	-150.5	-209.0	-340.0	-24.1	25.1	0.5	15.5	-17.0	44.0	235.5
Overrun	394.5	67.6	173.5	54.0	0.0	150.5	209.0	340.0	24.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0
<b>5.2 Focus the Model</b>															
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	141.0	105.5	163.5	55.0	20.0	141.0	431.0	563.0	112.0	13.5	601.0	34.0	0.0	12.0	184.0
Remaining	667.5	-38.1	116.5	15.0	45.6	-75.4	199.0	417.0	-48.1	62.6	-207.3	31.5	63.0	58.0	341.0
Overrun	0.0	38.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.4	0.0	0.0	48.1	0.0	207.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>6 Functional Spec of Demonstrator</b>															
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	105.0		1119.3		85.5	24.0	0.0	126.0	0.0	2.5	241.0	112.0			0.0
Remaining	29.8		280.8		45.8	107.3	140.0	-3.5	127.8	73.6	-109.8	18.9			131.3
Overrun	0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	109.8	0.0			0.0
<b>7 System Development</b>															
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	56.5	394.0	15.0	340.0	40.0	110.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remaining	539.0	280.4	3666.0	335.0	1103.8	353.8	870.0	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
<b>8 Test of the Demonstrator</b>															
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
<b>9 Maintenance Suite</b>															
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	245.0	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	1067.5	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
<b>10 Assessment and Evaluation</b>															
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
<b>11 Exploitation Planning</b>															
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**

	<b>Budget Totals</b>	<b>Used</b>	<b>Percentage Used</b>
<b>1 Mgmt. &amp; Admin Mgmt.</b>	8781.5	6043.3	68.8
<b>2 Dissemination &amp; Concertation</b>	4450.1	1512.0	34.0
<b>3 Standards Representation</b>	3252.2	1270.0	39.1
<b>4 Data Representation Study</b>	5147.8	1665.3	32.3
<b>5.1 Model Requirements Analysis</b>	4483.3	2888.0	64.4
<b>5.2 Focus the Model</b>	4224.3	2111.5	50.0
<b>6 Functional Spec of Demonstrator</b>	2657.0	591.0	22.2
<b>7 System Development</b>	10640.0	490.0	4.6
<b>8 Test of the Demonstrator</b>	3738.2	0.0	0.0
<b>9 Maintenance Suite</b>	4206.5	245.0	5.8
<b>10 Assessment and Evaluation</b>	4137.2	0.0	0.0
<b>11 Exploitation Planning</b>	1812.8	0.0	0.0
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>57530.9</b>	<b>16816.0</b>	<b>29.2</b>

Totals by Partner

Partner	Total Budget (hours)	Budget Used to Date (hours)
SBB	9769	5903
DLA	1550	474
JRS	7700	2485
FDÖP	1610	437
UoB	6366	2204
CNS	4463	2003
ÖNB	5950	2619
BN	3675	2013
UCM	2747	755
SNL	1523	255
NUK	3478	1850
IMEC	2422	1022
BL	1323	356
GSA	1610	221
RA	3347	702

