



Project Acronym: Europeana Sounds
Grant Agreement no: 620591
Project Title: Europeana Sounds

MS49 Advisory Board Meeting MS50 Plenary Consortium Meeting

Revision: Final
Date: 03/03/2016
Authors: Eva Hayles Gledhill (BL)
Laura Miles (BL)
Richard Ranft (BL)

Abstract: This document provides a brief report of two project events – Advisory Board meeting and Plenary Consortium meeting – held in Lisbon, Portugal, in January 2016. This document provides details of the attendees and content of the meetings, and the agreed outcomes resulting from the discussions.

Dissemination level	
Public	X
Confidential, only for the members of the Consortium and Commission Services	



Coordinated by the British Library, the Europeana Sounds project is co-funded by the European Union, through the ICT Policy Support Programme as part of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP) http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/ict_psp/



Revision history

Version	Status	Name, organisation	Date	Changes
0.2	1st draft	Eva Hayles Gledhill (BL)	02/03/2016	
1.0	Final	Richard Ranft, BL	02/03/2016	Layout, minor changes

Distribution

No.	Date	Comment	Partner / WP
1	02/03/2016	Submitted to the European Commission	BL/WP7
2	02/03/2016	Posted on Europeana Pro website	BL/WP7
3	02/03/2016	Distributed to project consortium	BL/WP7

Application area

This document is a formal output for the European Commission, applicable to all members of the Europeana Sounds project and beneficiaries. This document reflects only the author's views and the European Union is not liable for any use that might be made of information contained therein.

Statement of originality

This document contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

Project summary

Europeana Sounds is Europeana's 'missing' fifth domain aggregator, joining APEX (Archives), EUscreen (television), the Europeana film Gateway (film) and TEL (libraries). It will increase the opportunities for access to and creative re-use of Europeana's audio and audio-related content and will build a sustainable best practice network of stakeholders in the content value chain to aggregate, enrich and share a critical mass of audio that meets the needs of public audiences, the creative industries (notably publishers) and researchers. The consortium of 24 partners will:

- Double the number of audio items accessible through Europeana to over 1 million and improve geographical and thematic coverage by aggregating items with widespread popular appeal such as contemporary and classical music, traditional and folk music, the natural world, oral memory and languages and dialects.
- Add meaningful contextual knowledge and medium-specific metadata to 2 million items in Europeana's audio and audio-related collections, developing techniques for cross-media and cross-collection linking.
- Develop and validate audience specific sound channels and a distributed crowd-sourcing infrastructure for end-users that will improve Europeana's search facility, navigation and user experience. These can then be used for other communities and other media.
- Engage music publishers and rights holders in efforts to make more material accessible online through Europeana by resolving domain constraints and lack of access to commercially unviable (i.e. out-of-commerce) content.

These outcomes will be achieved through a network of leading sound archives working with specialists in audiovisual technology, rights issues, and software development. The network will expand to include other data-providers and mainstream distribution platforms (Historypin, Spotify, SoundCloud) to ensure the widest possible availability of their content.

For more information, visit <http://pro.europeana.eu/web/europeana-sounds> and <http://www.europeanasounds.eu>

Copyright notice

Copyright © Members of the Europeana Sounds Consortium, 2014-2017. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons CC-BY License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Contents

Executive summary: MS49 Advisory Board Meeting and MS50 Plenary Consortium Meeting	5
1 Introduction	5
2 List of Attendees	5
2.1 Advisory Board Meeting	5
2.2 Plenary Consortium Meeting	6
3 Summary of Advisory Board meeting	7
4 Summary of Plenary meeting	7
5 Conclusion	10
Appendix A: Meeting Agenda	11
Appendix B: Advisory Board Minutes	16

Executive summary: MS49 Advisory Board Meeting and MS50 Plenary Consortium Meeting

This report summarises the Europeana Sounds Advisory Board Meeting which took place on 27 January 2015, and the Plenary Consortium Meeting that took place on 28-29 January 2015, at the Teatro Nacional São Carlos, Lisbon, Portugal. The report includes a summary of the sessions held at the meeting, a list of attendees and a link to the blog summarising the event for our public audience. This report marks the completion of two year 3 project milestones: *MS49 Advisory Board Meeting* and *MS50 Plenary Consortium Meeting*.

1 Introduction

The European Sounds Advisory Board meeting on 27 January 2015 and the Plenary Consortium Meeting on 28-29 January 20, were held at the the Teatro Nacional São Carlos, Lisbon, Portugal. This venue was organised by Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas (FCSH), at the University of Lisboa, and the meetings were organised by WP7 based at the British Library. The aim of the Plenary Meeting was to bring together representatives of all 24 consortium partners, representing content providers, specialists and software developers, to discuss the project's progress, outcomes, and any problems faced. The Advisory Board meeting, held on the day before the Plenary, provided an opportunity for members of the Board to hear presentations on progress and future plans from Work Package leads and representatives, and to provide feedback and advice.

2 List of Attendees

The following project partners and Advisory Board members attended the events.

2.1 Advisory Board Meeting

- Richard Ranft, *British Library (BL)*
- Laura Miles, *British Library (BL) WP7 Lead*
- Eva Hayles Gledhill, *British Library (BL)*
- Tom Miles, *British Library (BL) WP1 Lead*
- Lisette Kalshoven, *Kennisland (KL) WP3 Lead*
- Maarten Brinkerink, *Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision (NISV) WP2 Lead*
- Axelle Bergeret-Cassagne, *National library of France (BnF) WP6 Lead*
- Vassilis Tzouvaras, *National Technical University of Athens (NTUA) WP5 Lead*
- Remy Gardien, *Europeana Foundation (EF) WP4 Representative*
- Pekka Gronow, *Advisory Board*
- Mark Plumbley, *Advisory Board*
- Amy Rudersdorf, *Advisory Board*

- Eggo Muller, *Advisory Board*

2.2 Plenary Consortium Meeting

- Marianna Anastasiou, *Friends of Music Society (FMS)*
- Anila Angjeli (*BNF*)
- Marion Ansel (*BNF*)
- Axelle Bergeret-Cassagne (*BnF*)
- Maarten Brinkerink (*NISV*)
- Jeroen Cichy (*EF*)
- Michael Fernau, *Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (DNB)*
- Zea Frana, *Austrian National Library (ONB)*
- Gabriele Fröschl, *Österreichische Mediathek (OeM)*
- Remy Gardien (*EF*)
- Jeroen Geerts (*EF*)
- Martin Gordon, *Rundfunk Berlin-Brandenburg (RBB)*
- Sergiu Gordea, *Austrian Institute of Technology (AIT)*
- Imogen Greenhalgh (*EF*)
- Pekka Gronow, *Advisory Board*
- Zane Grosa, *National Library of Latvia (NLL)*
- Tresa Harkin, *Irish Traditional Music Archive (ITMA)*
- Eva Hayles Gledhill (*BL*)
- Aude Julien Da Cruz Lima, *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)*
- Brigitte Jansen (*NISV*)
- Max Kaiser (*ONB*)
- Lisette Kalshoven (*KL*)
- Johannes Kapeller (*OeM*)
- Paul Keller, (*KL*)
- Alexander König, *The Language Archive (TLA)*
- Mairead MacDonald, *Tobar an Dualchais (TAD)*
- Hugo Manguinhas (*EF*)
- Juozas Markauskas, *DIZI*
- Jim McAllister, *Comhaltas Ceoltoiri Eireann (CCE)*
- Laura Miles (*BL*)
- Tom Miles (*BL*)
- Eggo Muller, *Advisory Board*
- Johan Oomen (*NISV*)
- Joris Pekel, (*EF*)
- Roxanne Peters (*EF*)
- Marzia Piccinino, *Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico delle Biblioteche Italiane (ICCU)*
- Alessio Piccioli, *Net7*
- Mark Plumbley, *Advisory Board*

- Maria Inês Queiroz, *Faculdade de Ciencias Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa (FCSH)*
- Richard Ranft (*BL*)
- Anne-Claire Rebours (*BNF*)
- Maria Fernanda Rollo (*FCSH*)
- Amy Rudersdorf, *Advisory Board*
- Alexander Schindler (*AIT*)
- Katherina Schöenborn (*DNB*)
- Sabine Schostag, *Statsbiblioteket (SB)*
- Elisa Sciotti (*ICCU*)
- Joséphine Simonnot, *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)*
- Grace Toland (*ITMA*)
- Vassilis Tzouvaras, *National Technical University of Athens (NTUA)*
- Tadas Valatkevičius, *DIZI*
- Harry van Biessum (*NISV*)
- Gry Vindelev Elstrøm, *Statsbiblioteket (SB)*
- Benjamin White (*BL*)

3 Summary of Advisory Board meeting

The agenda for this meeting is included in Appendix B.

- Welcome and Project Status report from Richard Ranft of the British Library, providing an overview of the project's current aims and outcomes.
- Ten-minute reports were then delivered by each Work Package lead or representative in attendance.
- Key milestones and deliverables were presented by Work Packages 2, 3, 4 and 7. These key topics all dealt with the outcomes of the project, and the accessibility and rights issues for those outcomes.
- The discussion was fruitful, and so productive that the meeting ran over by half an hour.
- A full account of the discussions and updates can be found in the Minutes of this meeting in Appendix C.

4 Summary of Plenary meeting

The agenda for this meeting is included in Appendix B.

A Welcome speech was given by Professor José de Monterroso Teixeira the director of the Teatro Nacional, in which the project partners were provided with a brief history of the opera house in which the meeting was being held, and were invited to tour the theatre later in the day. Richard Ranft then delivered the project status report to contextualise the discussions to be had, covering the project's recent achievements and its aims for the next year. The General Assembly meeting that followed acted as the projects 'town hall' meeting, in which key issues were raised and important information delivered to all project partners.

The next session was a data providers' clinic led by WP1 lead Tom Miles and Jeroen Cichy, which showcased some of the highlights available within the content already uploaded to Europeana and addressed certain key concerns of data providers.

A break for lunch was accompanied by the taking of a group photograph of participants to memorialise the event.



Figure 1. The Europeana Sounds team during the second plenary meeting (CC0)

WP2 lead Maarten Brinkerink provided an update on the crowdsourcing apps and platforms such as Tunepal. Unfortunately, the absence of Breandan Knowlton (Historypin) meant that there was no musician present to give a live demonstration of Tunepal in action.

Next was a WP3 update from Lisette Kalshoven that reported on the discussions and outcomes of the WP3 update meeting held the previous day. The agreement of IPR policy recommendations was the key topic, and Lisette outlined the proposed recommendations to the European Commission.

WP4 representatives Remy Gardien and Joris Pekel presented the new Music Collections management and curation. This session started productive discussions with data providers on how to showcase their content within the Music Collection. The process of curating, and collaboration between curator and Europeana, was outlined clearly and simply. This discussion was joined by members of the Advisory Board, who fed back key perspectives from a user-oriented standpoint.

WP5 lead Vassilis Tzouvakas provided an update on the problem solving and bug fixing that NTUA have been doing, and provided a Q&A on issues with MINT for data providers. This discussion also involved key members of the Advisory Board who were able to develop their understanding on the internal structures and platforms used by project partners.

The first day of the meeting ended with a discussion around the technical and IPR accessibility and openness of the collections for inclusion within the Music Collection and wider re-use, led by Lisette and Maarten. This discussion cleared up some common misconceptions and brought to light confusions that several data providers had about technical accessibility.

The second day of the Plenary meeting opened with parallel sessions. The Technical Co-ordination Group Meeting, led by Maarten Brinkerink and Johann Oomen, brought together representatives from WP2, WP4 and WP5 to discuss the software development aspects of the project. The Music Channel editorial team workshop, led by Joris Pekel and Imogen Greenhalgh, continued some of the discussions from the previous day and helped project partners and Europeana representatives understand each other's needs, strengths and limitations.

Advisory Board member Prof. Mark Plumbley of the University of Surrey then presented on the development of the new Audiocommons project. Mark's presentation highlighted the potential for collaborative engagement between platforms hosting digital audio content and related media. His talk echoed back to earlier discussions about rights management, shared technical standards, and sustainability issues such as funding. The following WP2 workshop with data providers picked up on several of the ideas Mark presented, and which had been raised in earlier sessions.

WP6 updated attendees on the dissemination activities which they have been undertaking, thanking project partners for their input and reminding them of the various methods available to promote the project in person and online. This was followed by a workshop to discuss the plans for the next public Conference. The location of the event at Vilnius, Lithuania to coincide with the Baltic Audiovisual Archive Council's conference was agreed upon, and three potential venues were proposed by DIZI representatives who will be coordinating the event. The delegates broke into smaller groups to discuss ideas for the theme and content of the conference.

The final session, before the closing remarks from Richard Ranft summarised the discussions and outcomes, was from WP7 and focused on project reporting. Laura Miles ran through the guidance available on NEF reporting and the upcoming periodic reporting at the end of the project's second year. Eva Hayles Gledhill then presented some results from a best practice survey of project partners, suggesting that overall partners do consider the systems in place to be functioning well.

5 Conclusion

Nearly all project partners attended the Plenary, with apologies for unavoidable absence, and took an active part in the proceedings. The work package leads provided guidance and received feedback on the current plans, and agreed on the direction for the next steps. The meeting gave individuals an opportunity to meet face-to-face, to explore issues that needed further discussion, and to go away with a clear idea of the timescales, and their roles and responsibilities, in the project for the third and final year. Increased clarity on reporting of partner's contributions, the key objectives for the project, and the relationship between the two, was evident as the discussions progressed.

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda



January 2016 Meetings in Lisbon Agenda

INVITE ONLY MEETINGS (WEDNESDAY 27TH JANUARY)

WP3 Meeting - Invite only

Wednesday 27th January 2015

Time	Topic	Responsible
09.00-16.00	WP3 Meeting (invite only)	LK/PK

Advisory Board Meeting (Attending: Advisory Board and PMB only)

Wednesday 27th January 2015

Time	Topic	Responsible
13.00-13.30	Arrival, registration	
13.30-13.45	PMB project updates: Project Status: 15min	RR
13.45-13.55	WP1: 10min	TM

13.55-14.05	WP2: 10min	MB
14.05-14.15	WP3: 10min	LK
14.15-14.25	WP4: 10min	RG
14.25-14.35	WP5: 10min	VT
14.35-14.45	WP6: 10min	ABC
14.45-15.00	Q&A: 15min	all
15.00-15.30	Coffee break	
	Themes and associated documents (selected milestones and deliverables) presented to AB for discussion and feedback	
15.30-15.45	Sustainability and exploitation MS47: Exploitation plan:	RR & LM
15.45-16.00	Europeana Music Collections MS22: Audio Channels first production version	RG
16.00-16.15	MIR D2.6: Music information retrieval pilot report	MB
16.15-16.30	Crowdsourcing D2.10: Development of crowdsourcing	MB
16.30-16.45	Policy recommendations D3.4: Draft policy recommendations	LK
16.45-17.00	Next steps and close of meeting	RR

Thursday 28th January 2015

PMB Meeting - Invite Only

Time	Topic	Responsible
08.30-09.00	Registration, arrival coffee	
09.00-10.30	PMB Meeting	All PMB

Thursday 28th January 2015 - Plenary meeting, all partners

The National Theatre of S. Carlos (Rua Serpa Pinto, n.º 9, 1200 – 442 Lisboa)

The Great Hall

PLENARY MEETING - ALL PARTNERS		
Time	Topic	Responsible
10.30-10.45	Registration, arrival coffee	
10.45-11.00	Welcome and introduction	RR and local hosts
11.00-11.10	Project status	RR
11.10-12.00	General Assembly Meeting	RR & LM
12.00-13.00	WP1 update and data providers clinic Showcasing highlights on Europeana	TM
13.00-13.05	Group Photo	
13.05-14.00	Lunch	
14.00-14.30	WP2 Update. Demonstration of crowdsourcing apps, Tunepal	MB and WP2 partners

14.30-15.00	WP3 Update	LK
15.00-15.30	WP4 update. Presentation of the new music collections- focus on management, curation and marketing. Demonstration and discussion. What this means for consortium and actions going forward.	RG & JP
15.30-15.45	Coffee Break	
15.45-16.15	WP5 Update MINT updates and Q&A	VT
16.15-17.15	Technical and IPR openness of collections	LK and MB
17.15-18.00	Building tour	FCSH have arranged
19.00-	Social dinner (at own cost): Lisboa à Noite (Rua das Gáveas, 69 Bairro Alto 1200-206 Lisboa)	

Friday 29th January 2015 - Plenary meeting, all partners

The National Theatre of S. Carlos (Rua Serpa Pinto, n.º 9, 1200 – 442 Lisboa)

The Great Hall

Time	Topic	Responsible
09.00	Arrival and coffee	
09.00-11.00	PARALLEL SESSION Technical Coordination Group Meeting (Held in the Foyer room)	JO/MB
10.00-11.00	PARALLEL SESSION Music Channel editorial team workshop (Held in the Great Hall)	JP
11.00-11.15	Coffee break	
11.15-11.35	External speaker - Mark Plumbley and Audio Commons	MP

	project	
11.35-12.35	WP2 - Workshop with data providers	MB
12.35-13.30	Lunch	
13.30-14.45	WP6 Dissemination update and activities Workshop about the second project conference with DIZI	ABC
14.45-15.00	Coffee break	
15.00-15.45	WP7 Project reporting discussion and Q&A and exploitation survey results	LM & EHG
15.20-15.45	WP7. Project reporting discussion and Q&A	LM
15.45-16.15	Conclusions and next steps. Close of the meeting.	RR

Appendix B: Advisory Board Minutes

Meeting Object:	Minutes of Europeana Sounds Advisory Board (AB)
Editor(s):	Richard Ranft (BL) – Chair Eva Hayles Gledhill (BL) – minutes
Meeting Date:	27 January 2016, 13:30-17:00 CET
Meeting Place:	Teatro Nacional de São Carlos, Lisbon
Attendees AB:	Prof. Mark Plumbley , University of Surrey (MP) Prof. Dr. Eggo Müller , Utrecht University, EUscreenXL (EM) Amy Rudersdorf , Digital Public Library of America (AR) Pekka Gronow , University of Helsinki (PG)
Attendees PMB:	Axelle Bergeret-Cassagne (ABC) Maarten Brinkerink (MB) Eva Hayles Gledhill (LB) Lisette Kalshoven (LK) Richard Ranft (RR) Vassilis Tzouvaras (VT) Laura Miles (LM) Tom Miles (TM) Remy Gardien (RG)
Apologies:	Prof. Martin Kürschner (MK) Dr. Alexandre Passant (AP) Frank Klaffs Johan Oomen (JO) David Haskiya (DH)

Distribution: Europeana Sounds Project Management Board, and Advisory Board.

Documents: Minutes and agendas are on Basecamp at
<https://basecamp.com/1936492/projects/6188212>

AGENDA

	Agenda Item	time	Responsible
1.	Opening of meeting and formalities	13.20	RR
2.	Project Updates from WP Leads	13.30	
	WP1		TM
	WP2		MB
	WP3: Draft policy recommendations		LK
	WP4		RG
	WP5		VK
	WP6		ABC
	WP7		LM
3.	Coffee Break	15.00	
4.	Key Documents and Milestones	15.15	ALL
	MS47 and D7.5 – Sustainability		
	Collections Feedback		
	MS10		

MINUTES

1. Opening of meeting and formalities

RR provided brief status update on project as a whole, with year 2 highlights and achievements, that the DoW was amended, a summary of the Deliverables and Milestones met, and the KPI's – only two of which were not yet fully met. Introduced the status of the planning for the year three conference in Vilnius in early November.

2. Project updates from WP leads

2.1 WP1

- Year two described as a significant year, as publishing onto the Europeana platform occurred, when in the first year data was on MINT but not yet uploaded to the public platform.
- Turn around in uploads reduced significantly from at least a month, to a matter of days.
- A community developing between the 18 providers online in Basecamp discussion groups, and though meetings at workshop. Not all questions posed are answered by NTUA, as providers gain experience and can help each other overcome challenges.
- As of the meeting time, 211,000 records on Europeana with 44,000 from NISV awaiting upload on 01/02. This means that we are on track to meet KPI 1 for 250,000 records available by the end of YR2.

- WP1 also beginning to work with Associate Partners (APs) to familiarise them with MINT and the mapping processes.

Q: EM asked whether the reusable content was all manuscript and print material, or also sound?

A: TM replied that there are some sound objects, but mostly print materials at this stage.

Q: EM asked how digital objects are counted – does a manuscript count as one object, or is each page an object?

A: TM answered each page is separate, as it can be accessed and used as an individual file.

Q: AR asked if all 211,000 objects are all sounds?

A: TM answered that no, this measure includes all objects. RR answered that there are two measures, one for audio files and one for all digital objects which included audio files.

2.2 WP2

- Updates on Crowdsourcing Infrastructure, Edit-a-thons, MIR, and Tunepal from YR2.
- Upcoming in YR3 are MIMO crowdsourcing with Pundit and annotations within collections.
- Recommendation that AB members read the WP6 blog which is very good at communicating developments in a ‘less stiff’ style than the deliverables documents.
- Recap of WP2 goal of enrichment through different means; external applications (annotation at origin or on Europeana portal, and Wikimedia all mentioned) and API – which enables enrichment and relates it to original metadata.
- Features currently being developed: creating simple tags, semantic tagging, and linking, updating and removing annotations for accuracy, searching annotations, basic moderation of annotation, and support for web annotation data model.
- Three edit-a-thons planned in YR2, each with distinct aims. 7 Edit-a-thons to be held in YR3, and these events will build on the experiences from the first three.
- MIR- development goal to find appropriate mix of audio features for a diverse set of sound files as in Europeana – from music to nature recordings. Plus, finding an appropriate algorithm to apply to a large collection over 350,000 or more files.
- Prototype software working to find similar recordings in Europeana and SoundCloud, by searching acoustic properties.
- Tunepal – a web version of the mobile app has been developed, and archival searching within the Europeana Sounds database is a part of this.
- New version of Pundit being developed: after Athens workshop providers were asked what kind of enrichment they wanted, and MIMO was the most often cited. Thus, Pundit development has focussed on this.
- Pundit works within the browser, with autocompletion of terms to ensure fixed-term usage.
- Annotations in Music Collection trialled as a prompt after sounds have been played, to add genre tags.

Q: EM asked is the Tunepal search on textual data and/or audio content?

A: MB replied metadata and information from textual sources such as notation, but not audio content.

Q: MP asked whether the Tunepal search was a ‘query by example’.

A: MB replied that it is not currently, but there is the potential in the future – to be raised in discussion of the relevant deliverable.

2.3 WP3

- Work Package extended by 6 months, past original due date of January 2016.
- Partners still working upon rights clearances and policy recommendations have been delayed.
- Want to ensure clarity in the public domain; working with right's holders to make 'putting stuff online' easier, in broad terms.
- How open is the Europeana Sounds content? 47.3% in public domain, 26.6% rights reserved (free access), and 23% rights reserved (paid). This is roughly half and half freely reusable, and rights restricted.
- Due to the known limitations, most organisations only promised content to the project that they knew they were able to share
- Important to know what the barriers are; whether it is funding, establishing the rights holder of the material, funding, or other consideration. Large amounts of material cannot be licensed.
- GESAC report on best practice in rights clearing was published June 2015, and is on Europeana Pro.
- IViR working to create the report as to how to make the process easier for institutions without legal expertise and paid legal advice. Simone Schraff produced the 'step-by-step' guide in December 2015. Available on EuropeanaPro, and contains policy recommendations.
- European copyright law is changing – thus the recommendations created by WP3 are responsive to this situation.

Q: MP How many audio files are public domain?

A: LK this can be checked by TM

Q: EM Is RRPA material acceptable to the project?

A: LK As long as there is an extract of decent length available, across Europe. It is unavoidable also, as RBB is a commercial organisation.

Q: PG public domain is a global consideration, how is this addressed?

A: LK We are working with the DPLA to look at global rights statements, so labels are accurate and applicable across markets.

Q: MP could Europeana Sounds be held liable for rights violations?

A: LK No, the liability remains with the institution who decided what material to make available.

RR: BL geolock content, which is one way round this issue. However, nothing is ironclad and such precautions can be circumvented. Thus, in practice it is ruled by access rather than law.

2.4 WP4

- Released the beta version of the Music Collections in December, with a survey on user satisfaction that was not quite complete at the time of presentation.
- Working with feedback on usability and accessibility, to develop the content management system for data providers and curators, and improved support for rich media – e.g. YouTube video and Soundcloud player embeds.

- Work with partners as follows: NISV for user annotations, AIT for API enhancements, Net7 on data modelling, and NTUA on extraction of information from media, e.g. waveforms.
- Focus in upcoming year – to address user feedback and data from heat-mapping of site usage, and to improve integration and embedding.
- Returning to previous interviewees from earlier user testing, to see how improvements are considered.

Q: MP who targeted in user survey, culture vultures or snackers?

A: RG both – some of the earlier users questioned are also internal to the project

Q: MP will general public be confused by label 'Music Collection', and expect more audio content?

A: a discussion between RG, EM, MB and MP about the prominence of the ability to filter by content types ensued.

EM raised the point that the term Collections suggested a greater amount of curation than was currently to be found.

RG agreed, with assurances that this is in development.

MB notes that this concept is tied into the collections idea, but is a challenge to facilitate in a sustainable manner after the end of the project. In the meantime, links by institutions and data providers based on their knowledge and holdings possible.

Q: MP Can further information be gleaned from sources such as Wikipedia, to automate some of the curatorial workload and enhance and contextualise the collections?

A: RG this would be part of API annotation development.

AR: provided an example from DPLA of 'volunteer resource pickers' who curate 'sets' of content for their site, over seen by a single member of staff. Over 100 sets created so far.

Q: EM can exhibitions be built by data providers currently?

A: RG hoping to develop this. In the meantime, the data is provided to Europeana who will do the technical work curation implementing the choices of the curation team each month.

2.5 WP5

- WP5 closely linked to WP1
- Standardisation for data providers and interoperability have been key, to ensure project-wide applications are possible.
- MINT solves this problem as it maps all variant data sets to EDM. Developed for Athena, it is widely used in Europeana projects.
- Improvements have been made especially for Sounds; e.g., filesizes have been extended and an integrated sounds thesaurus developed to transform information from one xml to another.

Q: MP Have other projects used other solutions?

A: VT only big providers have access to other sources and only for mapping as other harvesters do not provide the transformation step that unifies the data. Thus, it can adapt to new Europeana mps or EDM, enabling all records to be transformed at once, and internally, although this process is not automated.

Q: MP Who will continue to do this after the end of the project, to ensure the records in Sounds Collection are up to date and accessible?

A: VT Europeana and providers could all access and update their data at any point.

Q: MP Is there a central directory to inform providers when and what EDM is changing? Can this be implemented?

A: VT structural changes would cause problems, as mapping would become invalid. For value changes, this would be no problem.

Q: MB How is this dealt with at the point of integration?

A: VT It is different for every project, but the structure of the EDM is quite stable

2.6 WP6

- Primary objectives for WP6 are to highlight and promote the project, to engage audiences, and build community.
- At the end of YR1 a communication toolbox was released internally to project partners to aid these aims.
- Online, virtual exhibitions have been hosted and the Sounds one was the 2nd most popular on all Europeana. Also, a sound timeline of Europe.
- In YR2 there was a rebranding and graphic update of the website, to bring the project in line with the wider Europeana aesthetic.
- Page views have more than doubled, and user numbers tripled in the 2nd year. And the social media presence of the project has expanded.
- At the annual conference there were 252 attendees, from 32 countries. And this was just one of 57 events throughout the year at which the project was presented, with a variety of audiences; professional, student, general public etc.
- The project has largely exceeded its KPIs.
- YR3 goals include: targeting four main audiences: data providers, creative, researchers, educators.
- Also promoting the outputs of the project, through the music collections and online branding such as #EuropeanaMusic
- YR3 will also be the most important year, with 12 events already planned from within the project

2.7 WP7

- Amendments were made to the DoW and approved; the new version is on EuropeanaPro.
- The YR1 review was completed, and the review date and location has been confirmed for YR2. The location is the British Library.
- WP7 were part of the planning for the Conference, and the current Plenary, in coordination with BnF and FCSH.
- Quarterly reports were compiled to ensure project deadlines were met and budgets were on track in spend.

3. Key Documents and Milestones

3.1 MS47 and D7.5 – sustainability and exploitation

- Associate Partners have started to join– two confirmed Koç University and Dublin Institute of Technology
- AP programme about sharing skills and access to the platform, for them to contribute new content.
- AP's receive no funding from within the project, but are welcome to attend workshops, and to access the discussion platforms on Basecamp to ask support questions.
- Potentially a webinar for training being developed to help AP staff gain training.
- There are plans to recruit 3 more APs in YR3.
- Looking into sustainability for the funding the music collection and continued curation, which is the only aspect of the current project that would require staffed input
- Hope these measures will encourage other organisations to step in and contribute content, skills, expertise.

Q: EM What will the suggested relationship with IASA bring to the project?

A: LM a task force within IASA will hopefully attract new AP's through further dissemination of knowledge about the project, and enable the ability to share experience and information between project partners and associate partners. There is also the potential for IASA to contribute some funding.
RR A meeting has been arranged with IASA next month. They have an active training programme at conferences, which Sounds project might be able to integrate into.

Q: MP: In terms of sustainability of software, are we building software that will continue, and what are the plans for maintenance? Is there a risk register for third party partners?

A: MB the annotations API is the core infrastructure of Europeana, so it is sustainable and is part of the logical development. Pundit is maintained by Net7 separately, and is used in different domains, so its sustainability is market dependant. Tunepal is not long-term sustainable as it was built by an academic, and is very specific to the skills and interests of the researchers who have developed it. Thus there are different levels of sustainability, but if one tool fails, no others will be affected to a great extent, and only a partial usability will be affected.

Q: EM: What is the long-term relationship with the academic community? EUScreen plans for student projects integration. They use the content, and then their productions are re-integrated into the site to add value.

3.2 Collections Feedback

- 6 week survey was performed from 16 December 2015, ending on 25th January 2016
- 120 respondents, as of the point of presentation.
- Detailed analysis of the responses will be posted on Basecamp.
- Target for the KPI on user satisfaction in 70%, and currently the survey results are 67% of users rating the service 'excellent' or 'good', which is very close.
- Visual design seems to either be very popular, or very unpopular, with few users rating a more neutral response
- The content is rated as 'good' by the majority of respondents, and over 50% would recommend the survey

- Responses from those who stated they were interested in music content were discounted as outside of the target audience.
- There will be a follow up on these responses with a wider survey. This survey was run on the platform, so was accessible only to visitors who came to the site under their own steam.

Q: MP: who are the demographic you hope to attract, and how will you recruit them?

A: RG: We will use the network of the project partners for dissemination.

MP: is it a problem that this is very focussed on the Europeana network, and therefore attracts only those who are already in some way familiar with the Europeana project?

RG: There is a document detailing the plan, which we will share to provide more information.

EM there is a need for more active recruitment of testers beyond the scope of the current projects and users.

Q: MP: How much can we automate? Such as hero images and supporting information scrapped from other sites on the web? What can be balanced between the key functions, what is not required for the continuance of service, and what can be maintained?

A: EM: there are ambitious plans for development, which suggests a costly development of management and curation.

3.2

Q: EM: What is the relationship between the tools created?

MB: strategically focussing by application so that if one fails only certain functionality is affected. Pundit focusses on MIMO, Music Collections annotation on genre. These differing focuses can thus be changed and moved if necessary. All connect to the shared API. Questions have been raised about moderation, as different environments use API differently, which require moderation.

Q: MP: a malicious or inept user can be identified in the API and isolated. Also, suggested use for the similarity search or 'fingerprinting' of audio files to locate anomalous labelling in metadata, and duplicate audio files.

PG: Agreed, that this would also be useful as a function externally for researchers.

AR: metadata will help in the compare and contrast aspect of this, as we already know there will be overlap in the records.

MP: suggestion for annotations linked to this, as a checking mechanism – if listener labels a track with a genre, a second question could be 'if this is [genre] is this new object also [genre]'.

Q: MP: what is the license situation with annotations made within the tools and the provision of written content by users?

A: MB: user generated agreement, but checks must be performed on external platform provided material not sourced from single individuals.

4. Wrap up

- RR – thank you for an interesting discussion