



europæana
inside

Grant Agreement 297292

EUROPEANA INSIDE

Control Export Evaluation Report

Deliverable number	<i>D4.1</i>
Dissemination level	<i>Public</i>
Delivery date	<i>July 2013</i>
Status	<i>Final</i>
Author(s)	<i>Nathalie Poot (KMKG)</i>



This project is funded under the
ICT Policy Support Programme part of the
Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme.

Revision History

Revision	Date	Author	Organisation	Description
v0.1	2013-06-24	Nathalie Poot	KMKG	Draft
v0.2	2013-07-03	Marco Streefkerk	DEN	Overall review
v1.0	2013-07-25	Nathalie Poot	KMKG	Final version

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise.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.

Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
1.1	<i>Background</i>	4
1.2	<i>Role of the deliverable in the project.....</i>	4
1.3	<i>Approach</i>	5
1.4	<i>Structure of the deliverable</i>	6
2	PREPARING TESTING ITERATION 1 ECK PROTOTYPE	7
2.1	<i>Development of the ECK in 4 iterative phases</i>	7
2.2	<i>Content Providers Survey.....</i>	7
2.3	<i>Content Providers Meetings</i>	8
2.4	<i>Content Ingestion Plan Form.....</i>	9
3	TEST PROCESS	10
3.1	<i>Communication plan.....</i>	10
3.2	<i>Test plan</i>	12
4	TEST RESULTS.....	15
4.1	<i>Evaluation Forms: Content Providers Survey and Acceptance Test Form</i>	15
4.2	<i>Communication and co-operation.....</i>	17
4.3	<i>Test content.....</i>	17
4.4	<i>Accepted Functional Requirements.....</i>	18
4.5	<i>First impressions of the ECK.....</i>	20
5	CONCLUSIONS	21
5.1	<i>Results</i>	21
5.2	<i>Impact and next steps</i>	21
	APPENDIX I: ACCEPTANCE TEST FORMS	23
	APPENDIX II: CONTENT PROVIDERS SURVEY (ITERATION 1 ECK).....	78

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This report is the first deliverable of Work Package 4 (WP4). The Work Package is dedicated to the **coordination of content** to Europeana: more than 960,000 records will be delivered using the Europeana Connection Kit (ECK).

This document deals with *Task 4.1: Test (control) Export* in which content partners were asked to create a 'package' of a small number of records using the Europeana Connection Kit and to prepare them for transmission to Europeana.

The **outcome of the process of the first testing phase** will be presented. Every content partner in the project had to run an initial control export of their content using the prototype Europeana Inside Toolkit. The report analyses the outcome of this process and highlights any issues arising from it.

1.2 Role of the deliverable in the project

This deliverable is the first of two reports on the testing of the ECK:

- *D4.1(v1) Control Export Evaluation Report* (due in July 2013): focuses on the results of testing of the **first prototype release of the ECK (iteration 1)**. This iteration was released in M13 (April 2013), testing took place in M14 (May 2013) and feedback was given at the beginning of M15 (June 2013).
- *D4.1(v2) Control Export Evaluation Report* (due in November 2013): will focus on the feedback of the testing of the **second prototype release of the ECK (iteration 2)**. This iteration will be released in M18 (September 2013), testing and feedback is required in M19 (October 2013).

The division between the two versions was made in the **iterative development** plan. According to the Description of Work (DoW), WP4 was to start in M15 (June 2013) and end in M21 (December 2013). However it quickly became clear that the development schedule of the ECK as proposed in the DoW was unrealistic and changes might be required to be able to follow a more agile approach as is commonly used in software development. A new development schedule has been drafted and takes into account four iterations of the ECK. WP4 will be able to test and report on each of these iterations after their release.

In accordance with the iterative development plan, **testing of iteration 1 ECK started early**, right after the release of the ECK iteration 1 in **M14 (May 2013)**. Feedback on the testing was given at the beginning of M15 (June 2013). WP4 will end after the last testing phase, which will be in M29 (August 2014).

WP4 started long before the actual testing phase. In the first months of the project, this work package maintained close contact to content partners. Work on the WP was carried out by setting up contacts with content partners, gathering information on their collections, experiences with data exchange and IRP issues.

WP4 is dependent on the outputs of WP2 and WP3 for its deliverables. The ECK iteration 1 was developed and released under WP3. The development of the ECK and consequently the evaluation of iteration 1 is based on:

- *D2.1 Requirement Analysis*: explanation of all ECK requirements, based on a survey among the project partners.

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

- *D2.2 Use Cases*: three use case scenarios.
- *D2.3 Recommendations for Technical Standards*: research on best practice and quality instruments already in place within the Europeana project family.
- *D2.4 Functional Requirement*: there are three kind of requirements: high level requirements, workflow requirements and non-functional requirements. The workflow requirements are identified as: manage, select, prepare, validate, supply, data acceptance and enrich and return.
- *D2.5 Technical Specification* and *S6.2 Technical Specification*: describes the overall architecture for the Europeana Connection Kit (ECK).

This deliverable reports on the evaluation of the various tools that have been developed as part of the ECK iteration 1.

The results presented will be used for:

- *D4.1(v2) Control Export Evaluation Report*: focus on results from testing ECK iteration 2.
- *D4.2 Content Export Schedule*: The full export of participants content will take place on a staggered basis. This schedule will provide an overall structure and sequence for the management of this process.
- *D4.3 (v1) Export Evaluation Report* and *D4.3 (v2) Export Evaluation Report*: After the full export of all participant records. These reports will provide a summative evaluation of this process and highlight any issues which will inform the technical development.
- *D4.4 Content Re-ingestion Report*: A small number of participants will use the EUROPEANA INSIDE tools to re-ingest the content back into their systems. This report will evaluate that process and highlight likely issues in rolling out re-ingestion for other users.
- *D4.5 (v1) Summative Evaluation Report* and *D4.5 (v2) Summative Evaluation Report*: Reports evaluating the outcomes of all export and re-ingestion activity and highlighting key issues for the final technical implementation.
- *D4.6 Revised Technical Specification*: Based on the recommendations of the evaluation reports, a revised Technical Specification will be produced.
- Work Package 5 (Production): their object is to use the lessons learned in WP2, WP3 and WP4 to develop and launch a full production version of the Europeana Connection Kit with accompanying support and documentation materials.

1.3 Approach

To **prepare testing iteration 1 ECK prototype**, surveys were sent out and meetings were held:

- Content Providers Survey (M3, June 2012): to gather information from the content providers on their experiences with online publication of content and data delivery to Europeana. It helped the WP4 lead to better assist content providers in the process of delivering content: first during the test control export and later for the full data export to Europeana.
- Two Content Providers meetings (M4, July 2012 and M7, October 2012): to remind the content partners on the objectives of WP4 and on their tasks.
- Content ingestion plan form (M9, December 2012): content partners were asked to create a 'package' of a small number of records that is representative for the collections that they will provide to Europeana through the Europeana Inside project. The content partners used this selection to test the first release of the ECK (ECK iteration 1) which was mainly concerned with the selecting and preparing of data.

To guide the **test process** a communication plan and a test plan were provided to all partners.

To **evaluate the testing** of iteration 1 ECK prototype content partners and technical partners needed to complete two evaluation forms:

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

1. Content Providers Survey: to see whether the communication and cooperation between the partners went fluently and to have an idea on the first impressions of the ECK.
2. Acceptance Test Form: to evaluate whether the ECK iteration 1 functionalities were present and worked.

1.4 Structure of the deliverable

The deliverable is divided into:

- Preparation testing iteration 1 ECK prototype
- Test process
- Test results
- Conclusions
- APPENDIX I: Acceptance Test Forms
- APPENDIX II: Content Providers Survey (Iteration 1 ECK)

2 Preparing testing Iteration 1 ECK prototype

2.1 Development of the ECK in 4 iterative phases

The ECK will be released in 4 iterative phases. Each of the 4 iterations includes specific functionalities as described in *D2.4 Functional requirement* and *D2.5 Technical Specification*.

This **iterative approach** replaces the more traditional waterfall approach that was originally described in the DoW. One of the main advantages is that new functionality can be given to users sooner, allowing them to find flaws while there is still time to correct them in later iterations.

While the technical partners develop and implement the ECK, feedback is needed on the functionalities, bugs, usability and recommendations can be given for improvements. It is the responsibility of the content partners **to test and provide feedback on these different ECK releases**.

Iteration 1 of the ECK considered all of the requirements from *D2.4: Functional Requirements* that have been designated as 'Must' have with the exception of the actual data push and harvest interfaces onto Europeana and other aggregators.

This iteration was mainly concerned with **selecting** and **preparing data**. However some other requirements (functional requirements marked as 'Should' or 'Could', High Level Requirements and non-functional requirements) have also been taken into account.

2.2 Content Providers Survey

A first **WP4 survey** was launched in M3 (June 2012) to gather information from the content providers on their experiences with **online publication** of content and **data delivery to Europeana**. Questions about their available metadata, the metadata formats and aggregation methods used, experiences with aggregators and other European projects were asked. The survey also inquired whether they were aware and had already signed the Europeana Data Exchange Agreement (DEA).

The survey gave insight on the content providers local situation, their experiences with the use of aggregation tools and made it possible to detect issues in the project's early stages.

Main results:

- 11 out of 13 CP have provided content to Europeana before
- 11 out of 13 CP could already export data in an XML format
- 5 out of 13 CP already have an aggregator and would use it to send content to Europeana in the future

All the content partners have signed the Data Exchange Agreement (DEA):

Content provider	DEA signed	Registered name http://pro.europeana.eu/web/guest/dea-signees
1 MNM/HNM (HU)	Signed	Hungarian National Museum, Hungary
2 PIM (HU)	Signed	Petőfi Literary Museum, Hungary
3 MFAB (HU)	Signed	Museum of Fine Arts Budapest, Hungary
4 RBINS (BE)	Signed	Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique, Belgium
5 KU Leuven (BE)	Signed	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

6	NAG (GR)	Signed	National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum, Greece
7	BEN (GR)	Signed	Benaki Museum, Greece (Under reharvesting conditions)
8	KMKG/RMAH (BE)	Signed	Royal Museums for Art and History, Belgium
9	SPK (DE)	Signed	Signed but not listed
10	SEI (PT)	Signed	Name still to be listed by Eur. (Município do Seixal, Portugal)
11	SLV (SE)	Signed	Murberget Länsmuseet Västernorrland, Sweden
12	HIM (UK)	Signed	Signed, but waiting on response from Europeana
13	CT (UK)	Signed	Collections Trust / CultureGrid, United Kingdom

Table 1: Overview all content partners that signed the DEA

2.3 Content Providers Meetings

There were two Content Providers Meetings in which the partners received information on what was expected from them for WP4:

1. Content Providers Meeting in M4 (July 2012) in Berlin (part of the first Networking Event)
2. Additional Content Providers Meeting in M7 (October 2012) in Brussels

Content Providers Meeting in Berlin (Kulturform)

A presentation was given on content and coordination. Content providers were asked about their own experiences with Europeana and were given the possibility to deliver input for WP2 (specification) by formulating requirements.

Content providers were reminded on their tasks as described in the DoW:

- T4.1 Test the export, with a limited set of records for each content partner
- T4.2 Full content export for each content partner
- T4.3 Test re-ingestion, just testing the functionality
- T4.4 Global evaluation of the processes
- T4.5 Finalize the technical specifications (K-INT)

In preparing for the test phase in M14 (May 2013) content providers were already asked in M4 (July 2012) assemble a representative amount of records. They needed to make sure that the data was conform the requirements and specifications for contributing data to Europeana (e.g. provide a URL to the online published record (isShownAt) and/or a URL to the online published photograph (isShownBy))

Content Providers Meeting in Brussels (Musical Instruments Museum)

This additional meeting in Brussels was organised to ensure that content partners were able to express their wants and needs for the ECK before the finalisation of the functional requirements (D2.4).

The 4 objectives of WP4 described in the DoW were repeated:

1. Use the Europeana Connection Kit (ECK) for the ingestion of 960,000 records content into Europeana
2. The 2-stage approach: 1. Test ingest – 2. Full ingest (Progress monitored by WP4 (monitoring forms))
3. To evaluate the robustness of the prototype Europeana Connection Kit (ECK) to refine the technical specifications
4. Participate in a pilot to evaluate the potential of the ECK for the dynamic re-ingestion of enriched metadata and UGC

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

A reminder on the roles and responsibilities of the content partners within WP4 was given:

- Timely content delivery using the ECK
- Input, evaluation, feedback and reporting on ECK

After the release of each iteration it is up to the content providers to do the testing and to give feedback on the functionalities of the ECK (which requirements were accepted, which were not accepted and why and which requirements were still in development and couldn't be tested).

2.4 Content Ingestion Plan Form

In M9 (December 2012) a **content ingestion plan form** was sent to all content partners to have an insight on the quantity and quality of their records.

Content providers needed to select a **representative set of records for testing** purposes of the different ECK iterations.

Each content provider:

- Selected about 1% to 5% records from the total amount that they need to deliver to Europeana according to the DoW
- Indicated the date when the test content would be ready
- Gave a description of the test data

Content provider	Full Content (DoW)	Test content	
Stiftelsen Lansmuseet Vasternorrland [SLV]	130030	1000	< 1%
Collections Trust [CT]	590000	/	/
Xantys Limited / House of Images [HIM]	100000	1000	1%
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique [RBINS]	3000	150	5%
KADOC KU Leuven [KUL]	10000	/	/
Município do Seixal [SEI]	17000	170	1%
Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum [PIM]	10000	500	5%
Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum [MNM]	30000	4500	16%
Szepmuveszeti Muzeum [FAB]	8000	155	< 2%
Benaki Museum [BEN]	13000	200	> 1%
National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum [NAG]	9000	450	5%
Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz [SPK]	10000	100	1%
Royal Museums of Art and History [KMKKG]	30000	300	1%

Table 2: Overview selection test content

Almost every content partner selected about 1% to 5% or more. Stiftelsen Lansmuseet Vasternorrland (SLV) stayed under 1% (1000 test records instead of 1300) and KADOC did not prepare test records since they have LIBIS (KU Leuven) as technical partner. LIBIS did not participate in iteration 1 ECK testing, because of the focus on LIDO, while KADOC uses MARC for describing their collections.

3 Test process

3.1 Communication plan

There are 26 partners in the project of which more specifically **13 content providers**. Every content provider is **assisted by their technical partner**. The one content partner that didn't had a technical partner within the project, the Szepmuveszeti Muzeum (FAB) has found an associated technical partner, Gallery Systems (TMS).

	Content Partner	Technical Partner
1	Stiftelsen Lansmuseet Vasternorrland - SLV (SE)	Collective access, Christian Bajomi - SLV (SE)
2	Collections Trust - CT (UK)	Knowledge integration Ltd. - K-INT (UK)
3	Xantys Limited / House of Images - HIM (UK)	Xantys Limited (UK)
4	Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique - RBINS (BE)	LIBIS/KU Leuven (BE)
5	KADOC KU Leuven (BE)	LIBIS/KU Leuven (BE)
6	Município do Seixal - SEI (PT)	Mobydoc SAS - MOB (FR)
7	Petőfi Irodalmi Muzeum - PIM (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)
8	Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum - MNM/HNM (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)
9	Szepmuveszeti Muzeum - FAB (HU)	TMS - Gallery systems (US, associate partner)
10	Benaki Museum - BEN (GR)	Zetcom - ZET (DE) + PostScriptum - PS (GR)
11	National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum - NAG (GR)	Zetcom - ZET (DE) + PostScriptum - PS (GR)
12	Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz - SPK (DE)	Zetcom - ZET (DE)
13	Royal Museums of Art and History - KMKG (BE)	Zetcom - ZET (DE)

Table 4: Content partners and their technical partners

There were on the other hand, more **technical partners** that didn't had a content partner within the consortium. It was required that they find an associate partner to test with. Not every technical partner succeeded in finding an associate test partner in time for testing iteration 1 ECK.

	Associated content partner (not part of the consortium)	Technical Partner
1	Bristol Museums	KE software Ltd. - KE (UK)
2	London Transport Museum	System simulation (UK)
3	(no test partner)	Adlib (NL)

4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muzej narodne osvoboditve Maribor / Museums of National Liberation Maribor (Associate Partner) • Galerija Božidar Jakac / Božidar Jakac Art Museum (Associate Partner) 	Semantica - SEM (SL)
5	(no test partner)	SKINsoft Ltd. - SKI (FR)

Table 5: Technical partners and their associate testing partners

To ensure that the testing went fluently a **communication plan** was presented at the Technical Partner Meeting in Leuven in M12 (20 March 2013). It was stressed that good **communication** and **co-operation** between technical partners and testing partners was crucial.

As a direct consequence, **five test groups were created in Basecamp** (27 March 2013). These groups need to feed and enable the discussion on the ECK development between technical partners and their respective content partner / testing partners.

Each group has a **moderator** following the discussions. He/she provides feedback to the WP coordination on the progress, the discussion and the ECK testing and evaluation reports. The moderator is however not the coordinator of the work in the groups. The members of each group create discussion topics themselves. The main purpose is that technical partners and content partners get in touch and share their experiences.

GROUP 1 – moderator: Gordon Mckenna (CT)

Content Partner	Technical Partner
Collections Trust (CT) (UK)	Knowledge Integration (K-INT) (UK)
Bristol Museums (Associate Partner)	KE software Ltd. - KE (UK)
Xantys Limited / House of Images - HIM (UK)	Xantys Limited (UK) (Culture Grid)
London Transport Museum (Associate Partner)	System simulation (UK)

Table 6: Content and technical partners in group 1

GROUP 2 – moderator: Isabell Ehrlicher (SPK)

Content Partner	Technical Partner
Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) (DE)	Zetcom (DE)
Royal Museums of Art and History (KMKG) (BE)	Zetcom (DE)
Benaki Museum (BEN) (GR)	Zetcom (DE) + PostScriptum (PS) (GR)
National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum (NAG) (GR)	Zetcom (DE) + PostScriptum (PS) (GR)

Table 7: Content and technical partners in group 2

GROUP 3 - moderator: Marco Streefkerk (DEN)

Content Partner	Technical Partner
(no test partner)	Adlib (NL)
KADOC (KU Leuven) (BE)	LIBIS (KU Leuven) (BE)
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique RBNIS (BE)	LIBIS (BE)/iMinds

Table 8: Content and technical partners in group 3

GROUP 4 – moderator: Nathalie Poot (KMKG)

Content Partner	Technical Partner
Petofi Irodalmi Múzeum - PIM (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)
Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum - MNM/HNM (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)
Szepmuveszeti Múzeum - FAB (HU)	TMS - Gallery systems (US, associate partner)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Muzej narodne osvoboditve Maribor / Museums of National Liberation Maribor (Associate Partner) Galerija Božidar Jakac / Božidar Jakac Art Museum (Associate Partner) 	Semantica - SEM (SL)

Table 9: Content and technical partners in group 4

GROUP 5 – moderator: Eva Van Passel (iMinds)

Content Partner	Technical Partner
Stiftelsen Lansmuseet Vasternorrland – SLV (SE)	Collective Access (Christian Bajomi) SLV (SE)
Município do Seixal – SEI (PT)	Mobydoc SAS - MOB
(no test partner)	SKINsoft Ltd. - SKI (FR)

Table 10: Content and technical partners in group 5

3.2 Test plan

To guide testing iteration 1 ECK an overall test plan was provided to all partners through Basecamp at the beginning of M14 (2 May 2013).

The test plan consisted of 4 steps:

1. Communication and collaboration
2. Test plans
3. Test content
4. Acceptance Test Form and Content providers Survey

STEP 1: Communication and collaboration

Content partners and technical partners had a shared responsibility in testing and providing feedback on the different ECK releases:

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

- Content partners needed to, with the support of their TP, **test and provide feedback** on the different ECK releases.
- Technical partners needed to assist their dedicated testing partners in the testing process, helping them to use the ECK, and to test and evaluate it according to the technical specifications described in *D2.4 Functional Requirement* and *D2.5 Technical Specification*.

STEP 2: Test plans

Technical partners were asked to share their testing plans with their content partner by the 16th of April 2013 in the testing groups on Basecamp.

The testing plans included:

- All requirements that have been developed and can be tested as part of iteration 1
- How the testing will take place
- When there would be the possibility for technical partners and content partners to test the new functionalities together

To organise the testing each technical partner set up a **test instance** of their CMS/ECK release for their content partner to access. It was the responsibility of the **technical partners to provide** the content partners **documentation** on how to use the new functionalities and test them.

When sharing their testing plan, it was important that all partners agreed on:

- The test use cases and steps
- The functional requirements that will be tested
- The acceptance criteria
- The proposed test instance

STEP 3: Test content

Each content partner has submitted an ingestion plan form to the WP4 lead. In these forms is indicated how many records will be provided for the test content ingest. It was the responsibility of the content providers to make sure that the selected content was ready to test iteration 1 ECK.

STEP 4: The Acceptance Test Form and the Content providers Survey

To gather as much feedback as possible, content providers and technical partners were responsible for completing the **Content Providers Survey** (appendix I) and the **Acceptance Test Form** (appendix II). The feedback in both forms are included in the deliverable.

Both evaluation forms were distributed in Basecamp at the beginning of M14 (first week of May 2013) and needed to be completed by the beginning of M15 (4 June 2013). This meant that content providers and technical partners had **one month for testing and providing feedback**.

Acceptance Test Form

The Acceptance Test Form is based on the Functional Requirements (FR) that were formulated in *D2.1 Requirements Analysis* and *D2.4 Functional Requirement*.

The purpose of the test form was to evaluate whether the functional requirements that needed to be developed for iteration 1 ECK were present and worked. The form needed to be completed by the content providers and the technical partners.

FR formulated in D2.4 as 'Must' have with the exception of the actual data push and harvest interfaces onto Europeana and other aggregators	Accepted, or not accepted or not testable?	Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
	To be completed by the CP	To be completed by the TP	To be completed by the CP	To be completed by the CP

Table 11: Acceptance Test Form: shared responsibilities

Content Providers Survey (Iteration 1)

The purpose of the Content Providers Survey was to see whether the communication and co-operation between the partners went fluently and to have an idea on the first impressions of the ECK. The form needed only to be filled out by the content partners.

The questions asked were:

- Accessibility test instance
- Assistance & documentation provided by the TP
- Difficulties in completing the Evaluation Forms
- Discussions in Basecamp
- Able to test content from ingestion plan form

4 Test results

4.1 Evaluation Forms: Content Providers Survey and Acceptance Test Form

Content Provider	Technical Partner	Acceptance Test Form	CP Survey
Collections Trust (CT) (Imperial War Museum)	Knowledge integration Ltd. - K-INT (UK)	YES	NO
Xantys Limited / House of Images - HIM (UK)	Xantys Limited (UK)	YES	YES
Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) (DE)	Zetcom - ZET (DE)	YES	YES
Royal Museums of Art and History (KMKG) (BE)	Zetcom - ZET (DE)	YES	YES
Benaki Museum (BEN) (GR)	Zetcom - ZET (DE) + PostScriptum - PS (GR)	YES	YES
National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum (NAG) (GR)	Zetcom - ZET (DE) + PostScriptum - PS (GR)	YES	YES
KADOC – KU Leuven (BE)	LIBIS KU Leuven (BE)	YES	YES
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique (RBNIS) (BE)	LIBIS KU Leuven (BE) and iMinds (BE)	YES	YES
Petofi Irodalmi Muzeum - PIM (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)	YES	YES
Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum - MNM/HNM (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)	YES	YES
Szepmuveszeti Muzeum - FAB (HU)	TMS - Gallery systems (US, associate partner)	YES	YES
Stiftelsen Länsmuseum Västernorrland – SLV (SE)	Collective access, Christian Bajomi - SLV (SE)	YES	YES
Município do Seixal – SEI (PT)	Mobydoc SAS - MOB (FR)	YES	YES
No confirmed test partner	Adlib Information System BV - ADLIB (NL)	NO	NO

Bristol Museums	KE software Ltd. - KE (UK)	YES	NO
Muzej narodne osvoboditve Maribor / Museums of National Liberation Maribor (MNOM) (associate partner) and Galerija Božidar Jakac / Božidar Jakac Art Museum (associate partner) (GBJ) Galerija Božidar Jakac	Semantica - SEM (SL)	YES	YES (MNOM and GBJ)
No confirmed test partner	SKINsoft Ltd. - SKI (FR)	NO	NO
London Transport Museum (associate partner)	System Simulation Ltd. - SYS/SSL (UK)	YES	YES (SSL)

Table 12: Partners that completed the evaluation forms

Feedback from the evaluation forms (see appendix II)

- Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) wasn't able to fully complete the Acceptance Test Form. They had difficulties in accessing the test environment (remote desktop server) and weren't able to do the testing in time. After the deadline, there were however able to test a few records.
- Semantica (SEM) has two associated testing partners. They asked them to fill out the Content Providers Survey.
- System Simulation (SSL) has an associate testing partner (London Transport Museum), but they didn't at the time. They were however able to test some data and to complete the test forms themselves.

Three technical partners and their liaised content partners did not participate in testing iteration 1 ECK prototype:

- 1) KADOC (KU Leuven) and RBINS did not participate since iteration 1 had a focus on museum content and export of data in the LIDO format, while KADOC and RBINS use MARC for describing their collections. Their technical partner LIBIS (KU Leuven) agreed with the technical WP3 leader K-INT that they would work on a MARC profile for Europeana Inside, but this will only be ready by iteration 2. A planning for testing the ECK functionalities was provided in the LIBIS test plan for iteration 2. LIBIS did however work on a LIDO installation of the ECK local to be able to offer an ECK solution for their museum partners in the future as well. This LIDO ECK test instance could not be made available on a webserver at this stage since effort needed to be invested in both MARC and LIDO instances. The testing therefore took place on a local installation. Functionalities were tested and the Acceptance Test Form was completed by LIBIS. Now that this initial ECK local LIDO installation has been tested it is now being redeveloped and will soon become available on a webserver.
- 2) ADLIB did not participate, because they hadn't developed iteration 1 ECK in time and they had no testing partner.
- 3) SKINsoft Ltd. – SKI were not able to do the testing and to complete the forms since their testing partner had to give up the project and they weren't able to find a new partner in time.

4.2 Communication and co-operation

Technical partners and content providers had shared responsibilities in the testing of iteration 1 ECK. While content providers needed to provide feedback on the testing to the WP4 lead, technical partners were asked to provide technical support and assistance during the testing periods. On the Technical Partners Meeting in M12 (March 2013) in Leuven was highlighted that excellent communication and co-operation between the partners was crucial.

Assistance and documentation

In the **Content Providers Survey** almost every content partner indicated that they had received **good technical support**. There is however room for improvement. Not every content partner received sufficient documentation or a test manual. They had difficulty in understanding how to test what was developed.

Basecamp

Two of the five testing groups on Basecamp were **frequently used**. Those were the groups in which several content partners tested with the same technical partner in the same test environment. For example in Group 2 tested BEN, NAG, SPK and KMKG in the same test environment provided by ZETCOM and PostScriptum. In those groups the posts by others proved to be very helpful.

Content partners that made fewer use of Basecamp, argued that their issues were internal and considered not to be important for the rest of the group. They communicated with their technical partner mostly by Skype and e-mail.

4.3 Test content

For iteration 1 ECK technical partners created a **test instance** where content partners could access a version of the CMS that had the ECK iteration 1 functionalities included.

The test environments that were created were a remote desktop server, live testing directly in the CMS of the content provider and a separate test instance that was directly installed in the museum.

Content partners reported that testing in the CMS and the separate test instance worked well. Several partners had however difficulties in accessing the remote desktop server. The remote desktop wasn't easy to install and didn't work immediately.

Dependable upon the test environment that was provided, there were differences in the amount of records that was tested.

Content Providers	Technical Partner	Planned test content	Content tested ECK i1
KADOC KU Leuven [KU Leuven] (BE)	LIBIS KU Leuven (BE)	0	0
Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique [RBINS] (BE)	LIBIS KU Leuven (BE)	150	0
Royal Museums of Art and History [KMKG] (BE)	Zetcom - ZET (DE)	300	10

Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz [SPK] (DE)	Zetcom - ZET (DE)	100	3
Szepmuveszeti Muzeum [FAB] (HU)	TMS - Gallery systems (US, associate partner)	155	150
Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum [MNM] (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)	4500	4500
Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum [PIM] (HU)	Monguz Ltd. - MON (HU)	500	500
Benaki Museum [BEN] (GR)	Zetcom - ZET (DE) + PostScriptum - PS (GR)	200	10
National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum [NAG] (GR)	Zetcom - ZET (DE) + PostScriptum - PS (GR)	450	5
Município do Seixal [SEI] (PT)	Mobydoc SAS - MOB (FR)	170	170
Stiftelsen Lansmuseet Vasternorrland [SLV] (SE)	Collective access, Christian Bajomi - SLV (SE)	1000	1000
Collections Trust [CT] (UK)	Knowledge integration Ltd. - K-INT (UK)	0	(no survey) CP
Xantys Limited / House of Images [HIM/HOI] (UK)	Xantys Limited (UK)	1000	1000

Table 13: Overview amount of records tested

The content partners that weren't able to test their prepared data:

- RBNIS: LIBIS did not participate in iteration 1 ECK.
- SPK, NAG, BEN and KMKG: these content partners tested with ZETCOM/Postscriptum and had to insert the test content manually in the test environment. It was too time consuming to do so for more than 100 records.

4.4 Accepted Functional Requirements

To deliver content to Europeana the first steps of the workflow to be undertaken are: **manage**, **select**, **prepare** and **validate**.

The functional requirements (FR) that belong to these steps and were designated as 'Must' have - with the exception of the actual data push and harvest interfaces onto Europeana and other aggregators – in *D2.4 Functional Requirement* were tested.

Content providers indicated in the Acceptance Test Forms whether the requirements were **accepted**, **not accepted** or **not testable** (see appendix I).

Manage	Select	Prepare	Validate
WFR.01.01 Export management	WFR.02.01 Selecting multiple records	WFR.03.01 Automatic EDM mapping	WFR.04.01 Validation
WFR.01.02 Revision	WFR.02.02 Selecting a	WFR.03.02 Preview	WFR.04.02 Feedback on validation

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

<p>history</p> <p>WFR.01.03 Notification changes to the ECK</p> <p>WFR.01.04 PID management</p>	<p>single record</p> <p>WFR.02.03 Selecting records based on values</p> <p>WFR.02.04 Boolean operators</p> <p>WFR.02.05 Indication of selected fields</p> <p>WFR.02.07 Reuse saved queries</p>	<p>mapping</p> <p>WFR.03.03 Editable mapping</p> <p>WFR.03.04 Mapping feedback</p> <p>WFR.03.05 Saving mapping</p> <p>WFR.03.06 Field explanations</p> <p>WFR.03.07 Automatic value insertion</p> <p>WFR.03.08 Check digital asset availability</p> <p>WFR.03.09 Thumbnail selection</p> <p>WFR.03.10 Multiple assets</p> <p>WFR.03.11 Defining media types</p> <p>WFR.03.12 Metadata field on IPR digital object</p> <p>WFR.03.13 Metadata field on IPR metadata</p> <p>WFR.03.14 Metadata field on IPR preview</p> <p>WFR.03.15 Mark mandatory fields</p> <p>WFR.03.16 Choosing a default mapping</p> <p>WFR.03.20 Conditional mapping</p> <p>WFR.03.21 Nested or grouped mapping</p> <p>WFR.03.22 Intermediate format mapping</p> <p>WFR.03.24 Apply PID</p>	<p>WFR.04.03 Edit invalidated fields</p> <p>WFR.04.04 Automatic license validation</p> <p>WFR.04.05 Test ingestion</p> <p>WFR.04.06 Align validation</p>
---	--	---	--

Table 14: Functional requirements that were tested in iteration 1 ECK

Most of the functional requirements in **manage** and **select** tested in iteration 1 ECK belonged to module 1 of the ECK: *CMS: ECK supporting functionality*. Those requirements were often part of the content partners CMS and were mostly accepted by the content providers.

Most of the functional requirements in the following steps **prepare** and **validate** were developed as a shared module, but often not yet implemented by the vendors in the test environment and couldn't be tested by the content partners. They will be tested as part of iteration 2.

Additional remarks:

- The Acceptance Test Forms were not always filled out very accurately. Not all columns are completed: often there are no comments from content partners and the notes of the vendor are sometimes vague.

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

- The Acceptance Test Form doesn't give an objective representation of the development of the FR. The completion of the forms depended not only on what was developed, but also on the expectations of the content provider. Some content partners tested with the same technical partner and yet have different results: while some accepted the functional requirement, others didn't.

For example – compare:

- Petofi Irodalmi Muzeum PIM (HU) and Magyar Nemzeti Muzeum MNM/HNM (HU): both tested with Monguz, however there are some differences in their Acceptance Test Forms.
- Benaki Museum (BEN) (GR), National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum (NAG), Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) and the Royal Museums of Art and History (KMKG): all four tested their data in the test environment provided by ZETCOM and Postscriptum. When the Acceptance Test Forms are compared, there are some remarkable dissimilarities.

4.5 First impressions of the ECK

The opinions on the part of the ECK that was tested are very diverse. There is a range that goes from **'very good'**, to **'good'** and **'very disappointing'**.

Like the Acceptance Test Form depends the overall evaluation partly on the expectations of the content partner. There are two content providers that tested in the same test environment with the same partner that gave the ECK iteration 1 respectively a 'good' and a 'very disappointing' evaluation.

5 Conclusions

5.1 Results

The testing of iteration 1 ECK prototype was considered a success. There is however room for improvement for the upcoming iterations. In the overall test plan were four criteria for success formulated: three of four were fulfilled.

Criteria	Completed or not?
The technical partners created a test instance in which content providers were able to test their data	Completed: all the technical partners did create a test instance. ➤ BUT not all test environments were easy to access (remote desktop). Consequently some content partners weren't able to test until the very end of the testing period.
A certain amount of test content is tested by the content providers (preferably 1% to 5% of the total amount of records that need to be delivered to Europeana)	Most content providers were able to test all their selected and prepared test records. ➤ BUT the content partners that needed to insert their data manually in the test environment, could only test just a few records .
All the content providers have been given the opportunity to test all the functional requirements listed for task 3.1.1 in Annex 2 of S2.6.	Not all functionalities that were foreseen for iteration 1 ECK prototype were developed in time. A few functionalities under validate and prepare will be part of iteration 2. By lack of documentation on testing, some content partners didn't know how to test the functionalities.
Content providers and technical partners were able to give feedback on the testing and evaluation that can be used for the upcoming iterations and for the WP4 report <i>D4.1 (v1) Control export evaluation report</i> (July 2013).	All content partners were able to give feedback using the evaluation forms.

5.2 Impact and next steps

These results will have an impact on the development of the ECK in the **upcoming iterations** and will be taken into account for the next deliverable: *D4.1(v2) Control Export Evaluation Report*.

In the upcoming months **iteration 2** will be prepared. This second iteration will be released in M18 (September 2013) (WP3) and testing and evaluation will take place in the following month M19 (October 2013) (WP4).

While technical partners assist their content partners in testing iteration 1 ECK, for iteration 2 there is need for more documentation on testing (e.g. a manual with print screens).

Iterations 1 and 2 of the ECK consider all of the requirements from *D2.4 – Functional Requirements* that have been designated as 'Must' have with the exception of content re-ingestion (WFR.07.01 - WFR.07.10) which is scheduled for inclusion in iteration 3.

The second iteration of the ECK will include **management overview of status** and **data publication**. Since delivery to Europeana is part of iteration 2, attention will be paid to:

1. Choice of aggregator

Content delivery will be via an aggregator. Content Providers without an aggregator will use the Inside Dark Aggregator that will be developed by Knowledge – Integration (K-INT).

2. Data mapping / Mapping to LIDO and EDM

To deliver content to the aggregator a **valid LIDO** is necessary. In *D2.1 Requirements Analysis* is mentioned that users without much technical knowledge should be able to do a simple mapping of their data fields without having to consult their CMS vendor. It is therefore important to inform the content partners that they have a part in the mapping themselves.

Appendix I: Acceptance Test Forms

Functional requirements	Accepted (A), not accepted (NA) or not testable (NT)?	Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
FR formulated in D2.4 as 'Must' have with the exception of the actual data push and harvest interfaces onto Europeana and other aggregators	Completed by CP	Completed by TP	Completed by CP	Completed by CP

		Collections Trust (CT) (Imperial War Museum) - Knowledge integration Ltd. - K-INT (UK)				Xantys Limited / House of Images - HIM (UK)							
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions	Accepted?			Notes by vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT				A	NA	NT			
Manage													
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.			1		Selection is currently done through arbitrary queries, the results of which are not tracked, rather than a dedicated field.	When there is a fields in the CIIM for indicating selection or suitability for Europeana, this should be more trackable	1			Europeana selection has a true/false value in a database which can get the results of exported data.		
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.	1				The relevant Adlib data is imported into the CIIM for this to be possible		1			The system logs which users edited records and offers a version control feature that allows a user to track changes on		

											a record.		
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.			1					1		Notification messages will be present if any changes have taken place.		
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.	1				PIDs are composed by the CIIM based upon primary keys and the source databases of various records			1		A unique identifier is automatically assigned or generated using the systems utilities.		
Select													
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple records	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	1				At the moment this is via manual specification and not via a user interface	interface in later iteration		1		A powerful query system allows custom searches in a usable interface to allow searches on multiple records		
WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.			1					1		Europeana checkbox allows individual selection as well as		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

<p>WFR.03.01 - Automatic EDM mapping</p>	<p>The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.</p>	<p>1</p>				<p>currently mappings are hard-coded not selectable (note that alternative mappings can be delivered as different OAI formats, although this requires the client system to use the appropriate one rather than being driven by the CP)</p>	<p>make available via ui in later iteration</p>	<p>1</p>							
<p>WFR.03.02 - Preview mapping</p>	<p>The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.</p>			<p>1</p>				<p>1</p>							
<p>WFR.03.03 - Editable mapping</p>	<p>The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.</p>			<p>1</p>				<p>1</p>				<p>Fields can be edited or added to map to lido.</p>			
<p>WFR.03.04 - Mapping feedback</p>	<p>The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.</p>			<p>1</p>				<p>1</p>							

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.05 - Saving mapping	The system saves the mapping for repeated use.	1				currently mappings are hard-coded not selectable	make available via ui in later iteration	1			A list of fields is stored in the system.		
WFR.03.06 - Field explanations	The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.			1					1				
WFR.03.07 - Automatic value insertion	The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g. language of record, content provider name.	1				currently mappings are hard-coded not selectable	make available via ui in later iteration	1			Tools are available for a client to insert a constant value in a table.		
WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability	The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.	1						1					
WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection	If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based			1				1					

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

	on input of the user manually or in batch.												
WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets	The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata record.	1						1					
WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.	1				currently hard coded	make available via ui in later iteration	1					
WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1				1					
WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata	The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1				1					
WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the			1				1					

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

	user manually or in batch.												
WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields	The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.			1					1				
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.	1				currently hard coded	make available via ui in later iteration		1				
WFR.03.20 - Conditional mapping	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of attributes and/or elements.	1				currently hard coded	make available via ui in later iteration		1				
WFR.03.21 - Nested or grouped mapping	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.	1				currently hard coded			1				

WFR.03.22 - Intermediate format mapping	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.			1				1				
WFR.03.24 - Apply PID	The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.	1						1				
Validate												
WFR.04.01 - Validation	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.			1			for iteration 1 validation was performed using the ECK but outside the scope of the system testing	1				
WFR.04.02 - Feedback on validation	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).			1				1				
WFR.04.03 - Edit invalidated fields	If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the			1				1				

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

	whole set.												
WFR.04.04 - Automatic license validation	License information is validated automatically.			1				1					
WFR.04.05 - Test ingestion	The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by Europeana.			1				1					
WFR.04.06 - Align validation	The system ensures that successful validation warrants validation by Europeana at ingestion as well.			1				1					

		Benaki Museum (BEN) (GR) - ZETCOM + PostScriptum PS (GR)				National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum (NAG) ZETCOM + PostScriptum PS (GR)							
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT				A	NA	NT			
Manage													
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.			1		Not ready for I1			1			MCK i1 updates the MCK logfile. i2 will hold this info in a separate database.	TP indicated a logfile for this.
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.			1		Not ready for I1				1			
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.			1		Not ready for I1				1			
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.			1		Not ready for I1				1			
Select													
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple records	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	1				CMS environment (MuseumPlus)			1				

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.	1				CMS environment (MuseumPlus)		1					
WFR.02.03 - Selecting records based on values	The system is able to select records based on specific values in a variety of fields: e.g. by location, by object category, by theme, by section, or by (part of) inventory number.	1				CMS environment (MuseumPlus)		1					
WFR.02.04 - Boolean operators	The system is able to combine filters with clear Boolean operators.	1				CMS environment (MuseumPlus)		1					
WFR.02.05 - Indication of selected fields	The system shows whether certain records or fields are or will be included in a selection.		1					1			This is M+ built-in object group functionality	This is MuseumPlus object group functionality	
WFR.02.07 - Reuse saved queries	The system is able to repeat a certain selection, e.g. for updates, so filters or queries must be storable and reusable.	1				CMS environment (MuseumPlus)		1			The M+ object groups are themselves reusable in the MCK i1 version.	The M+ object groups appear in the MCK application and can be reused.	
Prepare													
WFR.03.01 - Automatic EDM mapping	The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1	Depends on the availability by ECK Toolbox		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.02	-	The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual		1		This is implemented in MCK i1. However the API has not been fully developed yet from ECK. This is WIP and will have to be elaborated during i2	There is a button in MCK. Not sure if this works properly.	
WFR.03.03	-	The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1			MCK has a fully featured editable LIDO mapping section	MCK has a LIDO mapping feature	
WFR.03.04	-	The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual		1		This version updates the respective logfile. i2 will hold this info in a separate database.	TP indicated a logfile for this. Not sure if this suffice	
WFR.03.05	-	The system saves the mapping for repeated use.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1			i1 saves the recent mapping.	MCK save the last mapping.	
WFR.03.06	-	The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1	Have to clarify this with the end-users during i2.		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

<p>WFR.03.07 - Automatic value insertion</p>	<p>The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g. language of record, content provider name.</p>			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1		i1 version uses constant values from the xml.ini file. i2 will develop the respective "preferences" section and will hold this info in a separate database.	Organisation name can be configured in external pfile (TP supported).	ini.xml. Improve the mapping component
<p>WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability</p>	<p>The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.</p>			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1		i1 uses the default thumbnail process of the LIDO Mapper. i2 version will address this functionality.	We provided thumbnails to TPs, not sure how these translate.	thumbnails perilifuei
<p>WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection</p>	<p>If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based on input of the user manually or in batch.</p>			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1		i1 uses the default thumbnail process of the LIDO Mapper. i2 version will address this functionality.	We provided thumbnails to TPs, not sure how these translate.	
<p>WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets</p>	<p>The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata record.</p>			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1		i1 uses the default thumbnail process of the LIDO Mapper. i2 version will address this functionality.		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1	i1 uses declarations from the xml.ini.		
WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1	i2 version		
WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata	The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1	i2 version		
WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1	i2 version		
WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields	The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual		1		i1 provides a LIDO preview on the mapping section.	MCK gives a LIDO view with all expected fields.	
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1			i1 saves the recent mapping	MCK saves the last mapping	
WFR.03.20 - Conditional mapping	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of attributes and/or elements.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1			

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.21 - Nested or grouped mapping	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual			1			
WFR.03.22 - Intermediate format mapping	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1				MCK outputs LIDO as the intermediate mapping	MCK outputs LIDO
WFR.03.24 - Apply PID	The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1				MCK i1 has implemented PID generation based on the provided ECK API. i2 will manage this info in the Assets section of the MCK Database.	MCK has a button for PID generation and writes output in a log file (TP indicated this)
Validate													
WFR.04.01 - Validation	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual						
WFR.04.02 - Feedback on validation	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual		1			MCK i1 logs the ECK exported success or failure (reports the provided EKC id). i2 will manage this information in the MCK Database	MCK exports to ECK and logs success or failure (TP indicated this)

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.04.03	-	If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the whole set.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual						
WFR.04.04	-	License information is validated automatically.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual						
WFR.04.05	-	The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by Europeana.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual	1			MCK i1 has implemented the call to the Export to ECK API	MCK has a button to "export to ECK" and logs the results (TP indicated this)	export eck
WFR.04.06	-	The system ensures that successful validation warrants validation by Europeana at ingestion as well.			1		Not ready for I1	Need for user manual						

		Royal Museums of Art and History (KMG) (BE) - ZETCOM (DE)				Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz (SPK) (DE) - ZETCOM (DE) SPK was unable to test ECKi1 because login failed.							
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT				A	NA	NT			
Manage													
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.			1									
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.			1									
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.			1									
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.			1									
Select													
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple records	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	1			CMS (search collection)								
WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.	1			CMS (search collection)								

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.02.03 - Selecting records based on values	The system is able to select records based on specific values in a variety of fields: e.g. by location, by object category, by theme, by section, or by (part of) inventory number.	1			CMS (search collection)									
WFR.02.04 - Boolean operators	The system is able to combine filters with clear Boolean operators.	1			CMS (expert search)									
WFR.02.05 - Indication of selected fields	The system shows whether certain records or fields are or will be included in a selection.	1			CMS (object groups)									
WFR.02.07 - Reuse saved queries	The system is able to repeat a certain selection, e.g. for updates, so filters or queries must be storable and re-usable.	1			CMS (object groups) + MCK (object groups)									
Prepare														
WFR.03.01 - Automatic EDM mapping	The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2								
WFR.03.02 - Preview mapping	The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.		1			There is a PID button, but it doesn't work.								

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.03 - Editable mapping	The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.		1			The mapping is foreseen, but it is not fully developed.							
WFR.03.04 - Mapping feedback	The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.		1			The mapping is foreseen, but it is not fully developed.							
WFR.03.05 - Saving mapping	The system saves the mapping for repeated use.		1			It is foreseen, but we were not able to test it. Will be ready for iteration 2.							
WFR.03.06 - Field explanations	The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.07 - Automatic value insertion	The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g. language of record, content provider name.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability	The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection	If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets	The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata record.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata	The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields	The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.	1				MCK gives a LIDO view with all expected fields							
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.	1				MCK saves the last mapping							
WFR.03.20 - Conditional mapping	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

	attributes and/or elements.												
WFR.03.21 - Nested or grouped mapping	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.22 - Intermediate format mapping	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.03.24 - Apply PID	The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.		1			There is a PID button, but not sure what it does.							
Validate													
WFR.04.01 - Validation	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.04.02 - Feedback on validation	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.04.03 - Edit invalidated fields	If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the whole set.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.04.04 - Automatic license validation	License information is validated automatically.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							
WFR.04.05 - Test ingestion	The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for							

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

	Europeana.					iteration 2							
WFR.04.06 - Align validation	The system ensures that successful validation warrants validation by Europeana at ingestion as well.			1		Not able to test. Will be ready for iteration 2							

		KADOC - KU Leuven (BE) and Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique RBNIS (BE) - LIBIS KU Leuven (BE)				Stiftelsen Länsmuseet Västernorrland SLV (SE) - CollectiveAccess							
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT				A	NA	NT			
Manage													
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.	1			CMS: The system allows to mark exported records in the metadata. This can then be used to make a selection of already exported, updated records			1					
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.	1			CMS: The system keeps extensive log files and can track new, updated, deleted records, including information on when, what and by whom a record was handled			1					
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.				Is a ECK functionality, not developed by LIBIS					1			
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.	1			CMS: Each record is given an unique identifier by the system. The system also deals with persistent deletion,			1					

					meaning that when a record is deleted, the identifier number can never be taken by another record								
Select													
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple records	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	1			CMS: The results of a search on object can be selected and added to a list in batch			1					
WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.	1			CMS: a record or records can be selected or deselected manually from the search results (toggle selection)			1					
WFR.02.03 - Selecting records based on values	The system is able to select records based on specific values in a variety of fields: e.g. by location, by object category, by theme, by section, or by (part of) inventory number.	1			CMS: The advanced search is highly configurable and any metadata field can be added to the search interface. Moreover you can filter on the values retrieved in a search for each of this individual field			1					
WFR.02.04 - Boolean operators	The system is able to combine filters with clear Boolean operators.	1			CMS: CollectiveAccess supports Lucene search queries. This uses the Lucene syntax including booleans.			1				Will do some more testing on this issue	

<p>WFR.02.05 - Indication of selected fields</p>	<p>The system shows whether certain records or fields are or will be included in a selection.</p>	<p>1</p>		<p>CMS: Cleary marks with toggle when selected. In a set an overview list is given of all of the records added to this set. Also the other way around: the record shows to what set it belongs if any. All fields of a record are included when part of the set.</p>			<p>1</p>					
<p>WFR.02.07 - Reuse saved queries</p>	<p>The system is able to repeat a certain selection, e.g. for updates, so filters or queries must be storable and re-usable.</p>	<p>1</p>		<p>CMS: search queries can be easily saved or deleted from the system. Also the creation of sets using queries and saving of sets are a useful functionality in this case.</p>			<p>1</p>					
Prepare												
<p>WFR.03.01 - Automatic EDM mapping</p>	<p>The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.</p>			<p>This functionality will be part of the ECK transformation service</p>					<p>1</p>		<p>Have made a LIDO mapping that works, will do EDM mapping in June 2013</p>	

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.02 - Preview mapping	The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.				This functionality will be part of the ECK transformation service . Thumbnails will only be visible in preview service. Quality of the metadata can be checked as part of the validation service.			1					
WFR.03.03 - Editable mapping	The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.				This functionality will be part of the ECK mapping service.			1					
WFR.03.04 - Mapping feedback	The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.				This functionality will be part of the ECK transformation and mapping service.			1					
WFR.03.05 - Saving mapping	The system saves the mapping for repeated use.				This functionality will be part of the ECK transformation and mapping service.			1					
WFR.03.06 - Field explanations	The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.				Manual will be provided with the ECK mapping service.				1				
WFR.03.07 - Automatic value insertion	The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g.	1			This functionality will be part of the ECK mapping service. But it is already possible to add constant values through batch			1					

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

	language of record, content provider name.				editing in Collective Access								
WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability	The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.	1			The resolver link (a persistent URL) is provided in the record to the publically accessible digital representation. The ECK validation service will check the availability of the thumbnail using the provided URL			1					
WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection	If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based on input of the user manually or in batch.	1			CMS: The preferred thumbnail already exist in the LIBIS repository and this URL is added to the metadata so there isn't need to additionally mark this. But it is possible to add a preferred type to each digital representation on resource level separately if needed. Items defined with type: preferred can then be used for creating the thumbnail.			1					
WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets	The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata	1			Multiple digital assets can be attached to the same record. When			1					

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

	record.				exporting the preferred thumbnail will be used to create the Europeana thumbnail. Other resource:ID and URLs can be included in the same record by repeating the resourceSet. Per resource set it is possible to define whether you want to copy and create a new record for each set, but the actual copy and creation is part of the export rules and should be defined there.							
WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.	1			CMS: Information can be added with the import script into the CollectiveAccess which is used as the ECK local. This system also allows batch editing so this info could be easily added in a later stage as well. This functionality is also part of the mapping service of the ECK.	CollectiveAccess is used as the ECK local. This system allows batch editing so this info could be easily added in the ECK local database		1				

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

<p>WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object</p>	<p>The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.</p>	<p>1</p>			<p>CMS: Information can be added with the import script into CollectiveAccess or after import with batch editing on a set of records. This functionality is also part of the mapping service of the ECK.</p>	<p>CollectiveAccess is used as the ECK local. This system allows batch editing so this info could be easily added in the ECK local database</p>		<p>1</p>						
<p>WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata</p>	<p>The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.</p>	<p>1</p>			<p>CMS: Information can be added with the import script into CollectiveAccess or after import with batch editing on a set of records. This functionality is also part of the mapping service of the ECK.</p>	<p>CollectiveAccess is used as the ECK local. This system allows batch editing so this info could be easily added in the ECK local database</p>		<p>1</p>						
<p>WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview</p>	<p>The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the user manually or in batch.</p>	<p>1</p>			<p>CMS: Information can be added with the import script into CollectiveAccess or after import with batch editing on a set of records. This functionality is also part of the mapping service of the ECK.</p>	<p>CollectiveAccess is used as the ECK local. This system allows batch editing so this info could be easily added in the ECK local database</p>		<p>1</p>						
<p>WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields</p>	<p>The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.</p>	<p>1</p>			<p>CMS: This is part of the validation service. It could be dealt with in an earlier stage by already checking for missing values when importing the</p>	<p>Some fields might not be mandatory in a CMS but are for the chosen export format (e.g. LIDO mandatory element, EDM mandatory elements). So an additional check</p>		<p>1</p>						

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

				source files into the CollectiveAccess ECK system.	on mandatory element should happen on validation service level.								
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.			This functionality will be part of the ECK transformation service		1							
WFR.03.20 - Conditional mapping	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of attributes and/or elements.			This functionality will be part of the ECK mapping service		1							
WFR.03.21 - Nested or grouped mapping	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.			This functionality will be part of the ECK mapping service			1						
WFR.03.22 - Intermediate format mapping	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.			The transformation service transforms the source file into an XML. Multiple XSLTs are possible for this. Once the source file is transformed to LIDO XML the transformation to EDM or any other format can happen		1							

					through XSLT. This is part of the ECK mapping service.								
WFR.03.24 - Apply PID	The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.				This functionality is part of the ECK PID generation service and will be checked by the ECK validation service			1					
Validate													
WFR.04.01 - Validation	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.				This functionality is part of the ECK validation service			1					
WFR.04.02 - Feedback on validation	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).				This functionality is part of the ECK validation service			1					
WFR.04.03 - Edit invalidated fields	If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the whole set.				The validation service can only validate one file or group of files. It might not be possible to select just a group of records and revalidate these only. The entire set might have to be revalidated in this case.			1					

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.04.04 - Automatic license validation	License information is validated automatically.				This functionality is part of the ECK validation service				1				
WFR.04.05 - Test ingestion	The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by Europeana.				This can happen by creating a set of test records in Collective Access			1					
WFR.04.06 - Align validation	The system ensures that successful validation warrants by Europeana at ingestion as well.				This functionality is part of the ECK validation service			1					

		Município do Seixal SEI (PT) - Mobydoc MOB (FR)					Szepmuveszeti Muzeum FAB (HU) - TMS Gallery systems						
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT				A	NA	NT			
Manage													
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.	1			Implemented in the OPAC Web Generator (OWG) Module of the CMS. Refer to Documentation "manuel_opacweb" in French			1			Would be implemented in CMS; not finalised, but ideally via a mechanism that allows simple querying by date to find exported records	Exported records can only be identified based on previous saved selection, without time indication of export	
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.	1			Handled by the logging function. There is no access to that function for users			1			CMS: at record level last date modified and user login is recorded		
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.	1			Handled by the OWG. There is no access to that function for users					1	?		Does a change need to be notified to the ECK?
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.	1			Handled by the OWG. There is no access to that function for users			1			Concatenation of Institution, Object Type and ObjectID: in ECK Module. Need to check against export		

												file		
Select														
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple records	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	1								1			CMS: via standard search tools; a saved query can be constructed	
WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.	1			Implemented in the CMS. Refer to Documentation "manuel_utilisateur"					1			CMS: via standard search tools	
WFR.02.03 - Selecting records based on values	The system is able to select records based on specific values in a variety of fields: e.g. by location, by object category, by theme, by section, or by (part of) inventory number.	1			Implemented in the CMS. Refer to Documentation "manuel_utilisateur"					1			CMS: via standard search tools	
WFR.02.04 - Boolean operators	The system is able to combine filters with clear Boolean operators.	1			Implemented in the CMS. Refer to Documentation "manuel_utilisateur"					1				
WFR.02.05 - Indication of selected fields	The system shows whether certain records or fields are or will be included in a selection.	1			Implemented in the CMS and OWG Module. Refer to Documentation "manuel_utilisateur"					1			CMS: check understanding of requirement; but dataview could be written to show fields per record included in a selection	The system is only able to show records that are or will be included in a selection, not fields

WFR.02.07 - Reuse saved queries	The system is able to repeat a certain selection, e.g. for updates, so filters or queries must be storable and re-usable.	1			Implemented in the CMS and OWG Module. Refer to Documentation "manuel_utilisateur"			1			CSM: see above		
Prepare													
WFR.03.01 - Automatic EDM mapping	The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable				1	ECK: CSM maps to LiDO; ECK to EDM?	The system maps to LiDO not EDM	
WFR.03.02 - Preview mapping	The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable				1	ECK		
WFR.03.03 - Editable mapping	The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1		should there be a GUI to adjust mapping from TMS to LIDO?	Mapping is editable in XSL format.	
WFR.03.04 - Mapping feedback	The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable				1	i.e. feedback on mandatory elements of LIDO not present etc. Consider in light of the above.		
WFR.03.05 - Saving	The system saves the mapping for repeated use.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1		Only to extent that editable in Views;		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

mapping											need GUI to modify mapping		
WFR.03.06 - Field explanations	The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable				1	No - currently no GUI: see above re 03.04. Published LIDO standard incorporated into TMS.		
WFR.03.07 - Automatic value insertion	The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g. language of record, content provider name.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1		Check: handle as part of the automatically generated XML via Configuration etc settings?	Automatic value insertion is available in XSL format.	
WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability	The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.			1	Aggregator	Not yet testable				1			
WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection	If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based on input of the user manually or in batch.	1			Implemented in the OWG of the CMS.				1				
WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets	The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata record.	1			Implemented in the OWG of the CMS.				1		Yes, but see 03.09		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.		1	Implemented in the OWG of the CMS.			1				
WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.		1	Implemented in the OWG of the CMS.				1	There is a Copyright field on MediaMaster table i.e. per image. But, no functionality for batch update, unless through 'copy and replace' functionality. Could be handled through a trigger.		
WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata	The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.		1	Implemented in the OWG of the CMS.				1	As for 03.12		
WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the user manually or in batch.		1	Implemented in the OWG of the CMS.				1	We don't have separate IPR information related to thumbnail, as opposed to linked image. Is this required? Check Requirement.		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields	The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.	1			Implemented in the CMS.					1	No current GUI to handle mapping, there not available.		
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.	1			Implemented in the OWG and CMS.					1	No; but check. Could currently be included in the Plugin i.e. when setting the plugin up, specify the mapping.		
WFR.03.20 - Conditional mapping	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of attributes and/or elements.		1		Implemented in the OWG and CMS.					1			
WFR.03.21 - Nested or grouped mapping	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.		1		Implemented in the OWG and CMS.				1				
WFR.03.22 - Intermediate format mapping	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.		1		Implemented in the OWG and CMS.					1	Not sure about this: all performed by CMS? Thought that CMS would have profile to LIDO, with ECK handling mapping from LIDO to EDM. But, could be done.		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.24 - Apply PID	The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.		1	Implemented in the OWG				1	Yes, the export should produce the PID. Needs to be done.		
Validate											
WFR.04.01 - Validation	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.		1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1	ECK	The system validates mapping results against LIDO target schema only	
WFR.04.02 - Feedback on validation	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).		1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1	ECK		
WFR.04.03 - Edit invalidated fields	If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the whole set.		1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1	ECK		
WFR.04.04 - Automatic license validation	License information is validated automatically.		1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1	ECK		
WFR.04.05 - Test ingestion	The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by Europeana.		1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1	ECK		
WFR.04.06 - Align validation	The system ensures that successful validation warrants validation by Europeana at ingestion as well.		1	Aggregator	Not yet testable			1	ECK		

		Petofi Irodalmi Muzeum PIM (HU) - Monguz (HU)					Magyar Nemzeti Muzeum MNM/HNM (HU) - Monguz (HU)						
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT				A	NA	NT			
Manage													
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.			1	Needs ECK integration	Planned in Iteration 2			1			Planned in Iteration 2	
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.	1						1					
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.			1	Not a CMS feature				1	Not a CMS feature			
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.			1	Integration with PID module not complete yet.				1	Integration with PID module not complete yet.			
Select													
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple records	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	1						1					
WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.	1						1					

WFR.02.03 - Selecting records based on values	The system is able to select records based on specific values in a variety of fields: e.g. by location, by object category, by theme, by section, or by (part of) inventory number.	1						1				
WFR.02.04 - Boolean operators	The system is able to combine filters with clear Boolean operators.	1						1				
WFR.02.05 - Indication of selected fields	The system shows whether certain records or fields are or will be included in a selection.		1		Works on the record level	The system able to show only records are or will be included in a selection.		1			Works on the record level	
WFR.02.07 - Reuse saved queries	The system is able to repeat a certain selection, e.g. for updates, so filters or queries must be storable and re-usable.			1	Planned for iteration 2					1	Planned for iteration 2	
Prepare												
WFR.03.01 - Automatic EDM mapping	The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.			1	EDM mapping is planned to be supported by the ECK, Qulto CMS currently supports LIDO as intermediate format					1	EDM mapping is planned to be supported by the ECK, Qulto CMS currently supports LIDO as intermediate format	
WFR.03.02 - Preview mapping	The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.			1	needs ECK, alternatively a LIDO Preview is being developed as part of					1	needs ECK, alternatively a LIDO Preview is being developed as part of	

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

					iteration 2						iteration 2		
WFR.03.03 - Editable mapping	The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.	1				Mapping is editable in XSL format				1	Manual editing is possible, not accessible from CMS GUI yet.		
WFR.03.04 - Mapping feedback	The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.	1				LIDO validation module gives feedback on mapping problems			1		Works for LIDO mapping, EDM is not implemented in the CMS		
WFR.03.05 - Saving mapping	The system saves the mapping for repeated use.	1							1				
WFR.03.06 - Field explanations	The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.			1	needs ECK / best practice guidelines Needs final LIDO profile					1	needs ECK / best practice guidelines Needs final LIDO profile		
WFR.03.07 - Automatic value insertion	The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g. language of record, content provider name.	1				Automatic value insertion is available in XSL format.			1				
WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability	The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.			1	Supported by ECK Validation, not integrated with CMS					1	Supported by ECK Validation, not integrated with CMS		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

					yet						yet		
WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection	If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1	Not supported yet					1	Not supported yet		
WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets	The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata record.			1	Not supported yet					1	Not supported yet		
WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.			1	Not supported yet					1	Not supported yet		
WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.	1				IPR information insertion is available in XSL format				1	partially complete (mapping dependent)		
WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata	The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.	1				IPR information insertion is available in XSL format				1	partially complete (mapping dependent)		
WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the user manually or in batch.	1				IPR information insertion is available in XSL format				1	partially complete (mapping dependent)		
WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields	The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.20 - Conditional mapping	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of attributes and/or elements.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		
WFR.03.21 - Nested or grouped mapping	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		
WFR.03.22 - Intermediate format mapping	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		
WFR.03.24 - Apply PID	The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		
Validate													
WFR.04.01 - Validation	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.		1			The system validates mapping results against LIDO target schema only!				1	Partially complete (validates against LIDO schema)		
WFR.04.02 - Feedback on validation	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).			1	ECK Validation not integrated with CMS yet					1	ECK Validation not integrated with CMS yet		
WFR.04.03 - Edit invalidated fields	If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the whole set.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.04.04 - Automatic license validation	License information is validated automatically.			1	planned in iteration 2					1	planned in iteration 2		
WFR.04.05 - Test ingestion	The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by Europeana.			1	needs ECK					1	needs ECK		
WFR.04.06 - Align validation	The system ensures that successful validation warrants validation by Europeana at ingestion as well.			1	needs refinement of validation rules					1	needs refinement of validation rules		

		Muzej narodne osvoboditve Maribor / Museums of National Liberation Maribor (Associate Partner) and Galerija Božidar Jakac / Božidar Jakac Art Museum (Associate Partner) ¹ - SEMANTICA (SEM)				Bristol Museums (Associated Partner) - KE Software							
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions			Accepted?	Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT						A	NA	NT	
Manage													
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.		1							1	CMS		
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1		CMS		
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.			1						1	CMS		
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1		CMS		
Select													
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1		CMS		

¹ The 2 associated partners from Semantica have each sent the Acceptance Test Form individually, but the forms were identically. They are therefore submitted as 1 in the overview.

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

records													
WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS	
WFR.02.03 - Selecting records based on values	The system is able to select records based on specific values in a variety of fields: e.g. by location, by object category, by theme, by section, or by (part of) inventory number.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS	
WFR.02.04 - Boolean operators	The system is able to combine filters with clear Boolean operators.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS	
WFR.02.05 - Indication of selected fields	The system shows whether certain records or fields are or will be included in a selection.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS	
WFR.02.07 - Reuse saved queries	The system is able to repeat a certain selection, e.g. for updates, so filters or queries must be storable and re-usable.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS	
Prepare													
WFR.03.01 - Automatic EDM mapping	The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.	1								1		ECK	

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.02 - Preview mapping	The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.	1								1	ECK		
WFR.03.03 - Editable mapping	The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.			1					1		CMS		
WFR.03.04 - Mapping feedback	The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.			1					1		CMS		
WFR.03.05 - Saving mapping	The system saves the mapping for repeated use.	1			Mappings are currently fixed				1		CMS		
WFR.03.06 - Field explanations	The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.			1					1		CMS		
WFR.03.07 - Automatic value insertion	The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g. language of record, content provider name.	1							1		CMS		
WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability	The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.	1			Standard CMS functionality via web export						ECK???	Currently there is no logic to check that a specified URL is actually available to the world. This is difficult to implement and varies according to internal firewall configuration	

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection	If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based on input of the user manually or in batch.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS		
WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets	The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata record.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS		
WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS		
WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1					1			CMS		
WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata	The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1							1	CMS		
WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the user manually or in batch.			1					1			CMS		
WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields	The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.			1					1			CMS		
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.		1						1			CMS		

WFR.03.20 - Conditional mapping	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of attributes and/or elements.			1					1			CMS		
WFR.03.21 - Nested or grouped mapping	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.	1			Standard functionality	CMS			1			CMS		
WFR.03.22 - Intermediate format mapping	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.	1							1			ECK		
WFR.03.24 - Apply PID	The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.	1							1			CMS		
Validate														
WFR.04.01 - Validation	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.	1							1			ECK		
WFR.04.02 - Feedback on validation	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).	1							1			ECK		
WFR.04.03 - Edit invalidated fields	If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the whole set.		1		Implementation of this feature will depend on whether it actually makes sense to develop it (speed gain vs. Cost of development)				1			CMS		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.04.04 - Automatic license validation	License information is validated automatically.			1			1			CMS		
WFR.04.05 - Test ingestion	The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by Europeana.			1			1			ECK		
WFR.04.06 - Align validation	The system ensures that successful validation warrants validation by Europeana at ingestion as well.			1			1			ECK		

		System Simulation (SYS/SSL)					
FR	Acceptance criteria	Accepted?			Notes vendor	Remarks	Suggestions
		A	NA	NT			
Manage							
WFR.01.01 - Export management	The system is able to tell which records have been exported when to Europeana.	Expected status: Accepted			MuseumIndex+ maintains the status of records with respect to the ECK in the ECK RX fields of each records.		
WFR.01.02 - Revision history	The system is able to show which records are altered when and by whom, so it can provide a base for updating exported records.	Expected status: Accepted			Intrinsic capability of MuseumIndex+		
WFR.01.03 - Notification changes to the ECK	The system transmits a notification when changes are made to the ECK that might have an impact on the local management.				Not implemented		
WFR.01.04 - PID management	The system manages PIDs for objects that can be used for identification when data is sent to Europeana.	Expected status: Accepted			MuseumIndex+ can provide PID provided a unique ID for the collection can be established		
Select							
WFR.02.01 - Selecting multiple records	The system can make a selection of multiple records.	Expected status: Accepted			Intrinsic capability of MuseumIndex+		
WFR.02.02- Selecting a single record	The system supports making a manual selection of multiple records or a single record.	Expected status: Accepted			Intrinsic capability of MuseumIndex+		
WFR.02.03 - Selecting records based on values	The system is able to select records based on specific values in a variety of fields: e.g. by location, by object category, by theme, by section, or by (part of) inventory number.	Expected status: Accepted			Intrinsic capability of MuseumIndex+		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.02.04 Boolean operators	- The system is able to combine filters with clear Boolean operators.	Expected status: Accepted			Intrinsic capability of MuseumIndex+		
WFR.02.05 Indication of selected fields	- The system shows whether certain records or fields are or will be included in a selection.	Expected status: Accepted			Records are selected individually, the selection of fields is global		
WFR.02.07 - Reuse saved queries	- The system is able to repeat a certain selection, e.g. for updates, so filters or queries must be storable and re-usable.	Expected status: Accepted			Intrinsic capability of MuseumIndex+		
Prepare							
WFR.03.01 Automatic EDM mapping	- The system converts metadata automatically from a predefined input format to EDM by (a set of) default mappings that is selected during configuration of the system.	Expected status: Partial Acceptance			EDM mappings not implemented. Implemented by external mapping tool. Should this refer to LIDO, not EDM?		
WFR.03.02 Preview mapping	- The ECK shows a preview of the converted metadata and associated thumbnails that are the result of applying a specific mapping. It also indicates the quality of the converted metadata including the thumbnail.	Expected status: Partial Acceptance			Thumbnails not displayed. Mapping tool shows converted metadata but not thumbnails.		
WFR.03.03 Editable mapping	- The mapping can be edited to correct/improve the metadata conversion from source to target data model.	Expected status: Accepted			Implemented by mapping tool		
WFR.03.04 Mapping feedback	- The system reports on problems with applying the mapping.				Not implemented		
WFR.03.05 - Saving mapping	- The system saves the mapping for repeated use.	Expected status: Accepted			Implemented by mapping tool		
WFR.03.06 - Field explanations	- The system informs on the expected input required for the concerned fields in the mapping.				Not implemented		
WFR.03.07 Automatic value insertion	- The system is able to insert constant values automatically for metadata not included in the collection database as defined by the user, e.g. language of record, content provider name.	Expected status: Accepted			Implemented by mapping tool		

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.08 - Check digital asset availability	The system ensures that an image is made available for access by Europeana or other targets to generate a thumbnail.				MuseumIndex+ manages and provides thumbnail but does not mandate its existence. Not yet implemented		
WFR.03.09 - Thumbnail selection	If more than one digital asset is linked to a metadata record the system can choose which image will be used to produce a thumbnail based on input of the user manually or in batch.	Expected status: Accepted			MuseumIndex+ provides designated "representative image"		
WFR.03.10 - Multiple assets	The system supports the use of more than one digital asset with one single metadata record.	Expected status: Accepted			Intrinsic capability of MuseumIndex+		
WFR.03.11 - Defining media types	The metadata and media types are defined automatically on record level or per batch.	Expected status: Accepted			Defined in the Europeana DX Channel record		
WFR.03.12 - Metadata field on IPR digital object	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the digital object based on input of the user manually or in batch.	Expected status: Accepted			System can be configured to embed metadata into a digital object.		
WFR.03.13 - Metadata field on IPR metadata	The system adds missing/corrected information on the IPR of the metadata based on input of the user manually or in batch.	Expected status: Partial Acceptance			IPR information can only be added by an authorised user. System can provide defaults in some cases. System can identify records where IPR information is missing.		
WFR.03.14 - Metadata field on IPR preview	The system adds missing or corrected information on the IPR of the preview (thumbnail) based on input of the user manually or in batch.	Expected status: Accepted			System can be configured to embed metadata into a digital object.		
WFR.03.15 - Mark mandatory fields	The system indicates which fields are mandatory for a chosen mapping or output data.				Not implemented. Will be available in next generation of the mapping tool		
WFR.03.16 - Choosing a default mapping	The system supports choosing a default mapping based on user input or system configuration.	Expected status: Accepted					

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

WFR.03.20 Conditional mapping	-	The system supports conditional mappings. The decision about which target field for some content may depend on the value in an attribute or in another element or in a combination of attributes and/or elements.	Expected status: Partial Acceptance			Fields can be combined but not used as tests		
WFR.03.21 Nested or grouped mapping	-	The system can perform mappings that consider the structure of nested or grouped elements.	Expected status: Partial Acceptance			Partial support so far		
WFR.03.22 Intermediate format mapping	-	The system can support sequential application of various mappings, e.g. native data model into LIDO into EDM.	Expected status: Partial Acceptance			ECK expected to provide EDM step		
WFR.03.24 - Apply PID		The system must check local identifiers in source data and enhance them automatically for global use based on configurations of the relevant CP.	Expected status: Accepted			Implemented by mapping tool		
Validate								
WFR.04.01 Validation	-	The system validates mapping results against chosen target schema, e.g. EDM.				Not implemented. Service from ECK		
WFR.04.02 Feedback on validation	-	The system reports on the irregularities of the mapping results (e.g. missing fields, missing thumbnails).				Not implemented. Service from ECK		
WFR.04.03 - Edit invalidated fields		If corrections are made then it should be possible to only reprocess these rather than the whole set.	Expected status: Partial Acceptance			Will be automated		
WFR.04.04 Automatic license validation	-	License information is validated automatically.				Not implemented. Service from ECK?		
WFR.04.05 - Test ingestion		The system is able to do a test ingestion for metadata prepared for ingestion by Europeana.	Expected status: Accepted			Implemented by mapping tool		
WFR.04.06 - Align validation		The system ensures that successful validation warrants validation by Europeana at ingestion as well.				Not implemented. ECK feature?		

Appendix II: Content Providers Survey (Iteration 1 ECK)

Content Provider	Accessibility test instance	Assistance & documentation provided by the TP	Difficulties in completing the Evaluation Forms
Stiftelsen Lansmuseet Vasternorrland [SLV] (SE)	Works fine	Works fine, as we are both TP and CP	Yes, a little. We have CollectiveAccess, and most of the functionality is included in the system already.
Collections Trust - CT (UK)	(no CPs survey)	(no CPs survey)	(no CPs survey)
Xantys Limited / House of Images [HIM/HOI] (UK)	Our clients report that the system is very usable to prepare data for Europeana.	We provided excellent documentation and telephone support for our clients to use our system but we handle the content preparation as both a technical and content provider.	No
KADOC KU Leuven and Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique [RBINS] [KU Leuven] (BE)	Did not participate in testing iteration 1. Iteration 1 has a focus on museum content and export of data in the LIDO format. KADOC uses MARC for describing its collections. LIBIS agreed with the technical WP leader K-INT that they will work on a MARC profile for Europeana Inside but that this will only be ready by iteration 2. A planning for testing the ECK functionalities will be provided in the LIBIS test plan for iteration 2.	Not applicable (MARC profile planned for iteration 2)	Not applicable (MARC profile planned for iteration 2)
Município do Seixal [SEI] (PT)	We have experienced some constraints regarding remote accessibility and security procedures that are implemented on municipal servers.	About the functionalities of CMS we have regular assistance and available documentation.	No, we have not experienced difficulties with this form.

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum [PIM] (HU)	Test instance is available since 2013-05-15.	We are using Skype to keep in touch with TP on weekdays during work hours. Generally we receive instant replies to questions.	It's easy to complete the Evaluation Functional Requirements Acceptance Test Form. We indicated the FR are excluded from "Test cases" and evaluated the other 24 FR (WFR.02.01- WFR.03.09, WFR.03.12- WFR.03.14, WFR.04.01- WFR.04.06).
Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum [MNM] (HU)	(not completed)	It worked well	Yes, terminological difficulties.
Szepmuveszeti Muzeum [FAB] (HU)	Currenty we are testing the LIDO plugin on our CMS.	We have no written testing documentation yet. We are discussing the needs and technical problems with our TP by Skype and email.	No, and the form raised some questions which would might have been overlooked.
Benaki Museum [BEN] (GR)	Has been improved since start date BUT still does "time-outs" while working (not idle) The test CMS was not configured as our local CMS so data was inserted as simple text (without thesaurus links and second language)	We have asked specific questions on Basecamp concerning the use of the MCK tool but there is no answer so far.	No difficulties
National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum [NAG] (GR)	During Iteration-1 we mainly tested the features related to Management and Selection of the objects. Functional requirements related Prepare & Validate have been partly tested and are not fully developed and are expected to be further tested in Iteration-2. Our evaluation refers to the tests that have been completed. Test instance: There were some problems at the beginning, which were soon overcome. It should be noted that testing was performed outside our production environment on a remote server managed by	The technical partner has been quite helpful and supportive.	No we didn't experience any difficulties, the Evaluation Functional Requirements Acceptance Test Form was quite clear. We only had to write the formulas that calculate the bottom-line sums.

	technical partners (ZETCOM, PS).		
Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz [SPK] (DE)	<p>Testing was very difficult:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The testing environment could not be reached from SPK office computers because of security standards. Setting up a different access point with private equipment was a time consuming process. Therefore SPK was unable to start testing until the end of the testing period. TP explained that they will not be able to provide a different test instance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TP provided CPs with an overview of testing steps for orientation. The instructions provided by Zetcom/Postscriptum were insufficient for speedy testing, because the testing steps listed what was to be done but not how to do it, The different elements and functions of the testing environment (M+, MCK and ECK Core environment) were not explained to CPs. A skype meeting was initiated by SPK between the TPs and some of the CPs of testing group 2 to solve problems that occurred during the testing Suggestion for next iteration: a Screenshot Manual <p><u>Other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No validation step was implemented in M+ which led to certain data not being exported Incorrect export data in every data set e.g. 'Hamburger Museen' 	Form did not apply to SPK because testing of ECKi1 wasn't possible since most of the functionalities were not yet developed.
Royal Museums of Art and History [KMKG] (BE)	There were some problems at the beginning to access the Remote Desktop Server	<p>Zetcom provided no documentation on the test environment. It was unclear how the records were to be tested. Postscriptum gave 8 test steps, but without a manual on how to perform them.</p> <p>When questions were asked and assistance was needed, Zetcom responded quickly and patiently.</p>	No, since most of the functionalities were not yet developed.

Content Provider	Discussions in Basecamp	Able to test content from ingestion plan form	Overall evaluation ECK (very good....very disappointing)
Stiftelsen Lansmuseet Vasternorrland [SLV] (SE)	No, the problems that showed up are more internal in our database	Yes, almost 1%	I have only tested the validator in the ECK and it seems to work pretty good.
Collections Trust - CT (UK)	(no CPs survey)	(no CPs survey)	(no CPs survey)
Xantys Limited / House of Images [HIM/HOI] (UK)	Yes	Yes	We are both a content provider and technical partner so we didn't have difficulty using the system.
KADOC KU Leuven and Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique [RBINS] [KU Leuven] (BE)	No, because there wasn't anything to test yet. We are waiting for the MARC release planned for iteration 2.	Not applicable (MARC profile planned for iteration 2)	Not applicable (MARC profile planned for iteration 2)
Município do Seixal [SEI] (PT)	No, because the existent problems we had, were not directly about iteration 1.	Yes. We made available to our TP 1% of records as established on our ingestion plan.	Not applicable
Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum [PIM] (HU)	Yes! https://basecamp.com/2069212/projects/1556855-europeana-inside/messages/10494128-testing-group-4	Yes!	Very good! It bids fair to become a fully functional ECK.
Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum [MNM] (HU)	We kept in touch with the content provider in Hungarian	Yes, we were	Good/very good
Szepmuveszeti Muzeum [FAB] (HU)	No. Only technical problems occurred which were resolved or being discussed through inner channels with our TP.	We have created a test selection with 150 records. This is 1.8% of the total records delivering to Europeana.	Good. Minor modifications will make it great.

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

<p>Benaki Museum [BEN] (GR)</p>	<p>Yes (in the testing groups)</p>	<p>1,5% of our records (200 records) have been selected for the test and have been gathered in an object group of our CMS since April 2013. However, we tested only less than 10 records because the tool provided could not take data from our CMS, so we had to put the records from scratch. Data was not linked to thesaurus since we were advised not to create a thesaurus for testing purposes. Data has not been inserted fully in Greek and English language.</p>	<p>Very disappointing because there were no user instructions and it is still under development</p>
<p>National Gallery-Alexandros Soutzos Museum [NAG] (GR)</p>	<p>Yes, we did post related comments in the Discussion Group 2.</p>	<p>We only tested sample data as part of the software testing procedures. We used the guidelines provided to us by the TPs as part of the WP3 development activities.</p>	<p>Good: Manage and Selection features are working good together with the MuseumPlus operations. The MCK application does this mediation. Certain features of the all the Prepare and Validate functionalities are addressed in this version, (e.g. WFR.03.02, WFR.03.03, WFR.03.04, WFR.03.05, WFR.03.07, WFR.03.16, WFR.03.22, WFR.03.24, WFR.04.02, WFR.04.05) however these are not fully developed. See our evaluation form for details.</p>
<p>Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz [SPK] (DE)</p>	<p>Yes, we did use Basecamp and found the posts by other members of the testing group 2 very helpful.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data-sets had to be submitted by hand, because the testing environment did not allow for import of existing data-sets. Therefore, in consultation with the other testing group members and the WP leader, it was decided to submit 3 data-sets instead of 100. • The M+ in the testing environment showed very different specifications to the SPK's database; therefore content could only be inserted selectively. 	<p>It was disappointing because we weren't able to fully test MCK and ECKi1.</p>

D4.1 Control Export Evaluation Report

Royal Museums of Art and History [KMKG] (BE)	Yes, by sharing our problems, content providers working in the same test environment could also benefit from the answers and vice versa, we learned that they experienced similar problems.	No, all the test records needed to be inserted manually. There was no time to do so for 300 records.	Very disappointing: all functionalities under 'select' were accepted (part of our CMS), but functional requirements related to 'Prepare and Validate' were still under development and couldn't be tested.
---	---	--	--

Associate CP and TP	Accessibility test instance	Assistance & documentation provided by the TP
London Transport Museum (LTM) - System Simulation (SSL)	Not applicable (form completed by TP)	Not applicable (form completed by TP)
Muzej Narodne Osoboditve Maribor (MNOM) - Semantica - SEM (SL)	The test instance was installed directly in our museum so it was easily accessible.	Our partner Semantika provided documentation, regular meetings and phone support.
Galerija Božidar Jakac / Božidar Jakac Art Museum (associate partner) (GJB) - Semantica - SEM (SL)	We had a test instance of Galis installed on top of our existing database.	We were in regular contact with Semantika, which set-up the testing instance.

Associate CP and TP	Difficulties in completing the Evaluation Forms	Discussions in Basecamp	Overall evaluation ECK (very good....very disappointing)
London Transport Museum (LTM) - System Simulation (SSL)	Not applicable (form completed by TP)	Not applicable (form completed by TP)	Not applicable (form completed by TP)
Muzej Narodne Osoboditve Maribor (MNOM) - Semantica - SEM (SL)	Since we're a late addition to the project, we had some problems understanding the form, especially all the functional requirements.	No, we received the necessary clarifications from our technical partner.	Very good. Fits directly into our CMS and our existing workflow
Galerija Božidar Jakac / Božidar Jakac Art Museum (associate partner) (GJB) - Semantica - SEM (SL)	We have been using Galis for almost 7 years and had no problems with the testing or with filling out the acceptance form.	NO	We see it as a very good upgrade to Galis CMS