Proposal Evaluation Form

	EUROPEAN COMMISSION 7 th Framework Programme for Research	**Evaluation Summary Report**

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	RIKSARKIVET	SE	869,663	20.35%	736,483	20.89%
2	PACKED EXPERTISECENTRUM DIGITAAL ERFGOED VZW	BE	80,870	1.89%	76,970	2.18%
3	PROMOTER SRL	IT	164,740	3.85%	161,540	4.58%
4	FRAUNHOFER-GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FOERDERUNG DER ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V	DE	69,125	1.62%	62,839	1.78%
5	HOGSKOLAN I SKOVDE	SE	77,345	1.81%	70,208	1.99%
6	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI PADOVA	IT	95,070	2.22%	82,270	2.33%
7	STICHTING NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR BEELD EN GELUID	NL	533,167	12.47%	427,992	12.14%
8	Koninklijk Instituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium	BE	511,540	11.97%	410,940	11.65%
9	ELLINIKO KENTRO KINHMATOGRAFOU	EL	145,325	3.40%	115,815	3.28%
10	LOCAL GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT AGENCY-AN GHNIOMHAIREACHT BAINISTIOCHTA RIALTAIS AITIUIL LGMA	IE	257,472	6.02%	204,232	5.79%
11	STIFTUNG PREUSSISCHER KULTURBESITZ	DE	508,970	11.91%	408,210	11.58%
12	AYUNTAMIENTO DE GIRONA	ES	235,035	5.50%	187,110	5.31%
13	Eesti Vabariigi Kultuuriministeerium	EE	197,050	4.61%	157,150	4.46%
14	KUNGLIGA BIBLIOTEKET (NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SWEDEN)	SE	528,745	12.37%	424,245	12.03%
	Total:		4,274,117		3,526,004	

Abstract:

Memory institutions are facing increasing transfers of electronic documents and other media content for long term preservation. Preservation models are often inspired by ISO 14721:2003, known as "the OAIS model", where transfers and preservation are built on information packages containing both data and metadata. Metadata is normally stored in XML and specified in different schemas controlled by the community of professional curators through international organisations. Data content are normally stored in specific file formats for documents, images, sound, video etc. These files are usually produced by software from different vendors. Even if the transferred files are in standard formats, the implementation of standards cannot be guaranteed. The software implementing standards for the production of the electronic files is not in control neither by the institutions that produces them nor by the memory institutions. Conformance tests of transfers are done, but are not totally reliable. Different software for testing could end up in different results. This poses problems in long-term preservation. Data objects meant for preservation, passing through an uncontrolled generative process, can jeopardise the whole preservation exercise. Main objective of PREFORMA is to develop and deploy an open source software licensed reference implementation for different format standards as a tool to be used by memory organisations to check conformance with standard specifications. The PCP, following the rules for tenders in public sector, will match the memory institutions professional knowledge and the supplier's skills in development and promotion of products and create a win-win situation. Joint procurement will enable PREFORMA to build a sustainable network of common interest, where the public procurers can remain in contact and cooperate beyond the EC funding period. Results will be broadly disseminated during the projects life time and summed up at a final conference.

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 11.00 (Threshold: 10.00)

Form information

For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments. Half point scores may be given:

> *0– The **proposal fails to address the criterion** under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.*

*1– **Poor.** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.*

*2– **Fair.** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.*

*3– **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.*

*4– **Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.*

*5– **Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*

Criterion 1 - Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)

Score: **3.00** (Threshold: 3.00/- , Weight: -)

The proposal aims at developing and deploying an open source software reference implementation for different standard formats as a tool to be used by memory organisations to check conformance of their digtial content with standard specifications.

The proposed concept and objectives are closely related to the objectives of Call 11.2. However, the scope of the proposed R&D to be procured is limited and the challenges that would be addressed are not sufficiently elaborated. Moreover, legal challenges related to proprietary formats and standardization are not well detailed. The proposal does not envisage clear safeguards that only R&D service contracts will be funded. The Consortium demonstrates excellent knowledge of the state of the art.

The CSA workplan strategy soundly includes steps to connect user needs, outreach activities and RTD activities. The detailed list of deliverables and milestones is in line with the overall structure of the workplan and relevant dependencies are sufficiently identified. However, some of the proposal objectives, notably the development of the scorer, the reporter and the fix suggestor, are not properly reflected in the workplan. The timeline for the preparation of the PCP call for tender and for the selection and award procedure is short.

Criterion 2 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management

Score: **4.00** (Threshold: 3.00/- , Weight: -)

The management and decision-making structures are suitable and early conflict resolution mechanisms are foreseen. Procedures to deal with quality assurance are adequate.
The individual participants demonstrate highly relevant expertise and an impressive research portfolio. The Consortium does not include adequate legal expertise or experience with implementation of PCPs, but this is being mitgated through plans to subcontract such expertise. The planned Advisory Board consisting of relevant external experts and organisations is commendable.
The consortium partners have complementary competences in relevant areas for the implementation of the project.
The allocation of person effort is well balanced and appropriate. The consortium partners also indicate clear commitment to engage own resources in the PCP stage. However, the budget reserved for the R&D related to the conformance checker is overestimated in relation to the expected outcome (two evaluated tools).

Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results

Score: **4.00** (Threshold: 3.00/- , Weight: -)

The proposal demonstrates potential for contributions to reducing preservation costs and to improving the capacity and competences of public organisations to deal with digital preservation.
The dissemination activities are extensively described and suitably identified. All partners are involved in disseminating the results of the project or are committed to using the developed solution. Various target groups for the promotion of the project results are identified and efforts are envisaged to encourage uptake of the developed solution. However, the proposal does not include adequate training activities for open source companies and memory institutions. Moreover, it is not sufficiently explained how engagement with the relevant standardisation bodies would be achieved.

Remarks

For the tender specifications, the Consortium would need to clarify if the conformance checker should cover all indicated file formats or whether it would focus on individual formats. Also, it should be specified how the competitive evaluation will be done.

Ethics issues

Status: **No ethical issues**