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PUBLISHABLE SUMMARY

The project Daguerreobase (CIP 297250)

In 1839 the daguerreotype process was announced. This was the first successful photographic process in the history of photography and the world. Daguerreotypes can therefore be seen as the ‘Incunabula of Photography’. Photography has fundamentally changed our way of looking at the world; the daguerreotype was therefore the start of imaging the rich visual culture we embrace today.

Daguerreobase is a public platform of archives, libraries, museums and private contributors from across Europe. Members can store, view and edit records of individual daguerreotypes with their housings and establish relations to other records. It is a unique research tool, not only for scientists, but also for collectors, photographers, the general public, historians, curators and many others.

Though the digital image is not the object itself, in aggregate they help us understand what we are looking at. We are able to compare, collate and build understanding of this important medium from the beginning of photography. By pooling digital images we enrich our collective daguerreotype heritage. This helps to highlight the significance of the original objects and thus the importance of preserving those originals. At the same time, this heritage will only come to live if we manage to decode them and explain old values from the past to make them relevant for contemporary contexts.

Period 3 was, after the second review, extended with 6 months, this report therefore covers the last 16 months of the project.

The general objectives of Daguerreobase

The general objectives of the Daguerreobase are:

- To aggregate high quality images and descriptions of mainly European daguerreotypes and daguerreotype related objects;
- To enable access to at least 75% of the still existing, highly significant but scattered institutional and private daguerreotype collections in Europe via Europeana;
- To enhance the quality of both new and existing Europeana content, in terms of its metadata richness, its re-use potential and its uniqueness;
- To enable improved search, retrieval and use of Europeana content, both within the Europeana portal and by third parties via the Europeana API.

In the third period focus was on 1. content aggregation, 2. dissemination and 3. sharing of knowledge.

1. Content aggregation

We managed to pinpoint an extensive number of daguerreotypes. In order to reach our ambitious target we needed to:

1. Trace daguerreotypes
2. Find digitized images
3. Find descriptive information in databases

Daguerreotypes are scarce and scattered; the largest known public collection is in the National Media Museum in the UK and contains …records. The smallest collections contain only 1 record, and that does not apply to just one collection, but 54.

Most collections include fewer than 20 daguerreotypes, these are numerically, a negligible part of the complete archive or collection. Some of them were not even correctly listed in the archives as daguerreotypes. In many cases descriptive information is limited to non-existent. Also, given the polished
silver surface, digitising takes a professional approach, which is time consuming. Convincing people to work with Daguerreobase was therefore a challenge. We had to convince institutes and collectors to digitize and describe.

The gap in information and digitized material, even in big institutions, exposes how vulnerable the project is. It also underlines the importance of Daguerreobase, a database for centralising information on daguerreotypes. The inventory can be extensive, but when there are neither digital images nor descriptions, and finances are not to be used for digitizing, the result remains below expectations.

To gain from a set of data, and to convince people of the added value of the database, you must reach a certain critical mass and richness. That was our biggest challenge in period three. We managed to aggregate more than 15,000 unique records, imported with high quality images from the front as well as the reverse and - if relevant - the sides and other details of the daguerreotypes and housings. In total this added up to over 34,000 images.

These 15,000 daguerreotypes are more or less half of all existing European Daguerreotypes. They come from 313 content providers and collections. From those collections 33% is private, these collections would have never been opened to a broad public if Daguerreobase had not been there.

**Uniqueness of the daguerreotypes**

The plates added in Daguerreobase include the earliest known photograph from Ireland and from Italy:

A street scene: one side of the street is illuminated in sunlight, with shadows on the road. In the image we also see a gas street-lamp, four-storey houses, windows, doorways etc. Taken by John Nott in about 1840 in Cork, Ireland. An inscription on the reverse of the frame reads: 'The first Daguerreotype taken by John Nott'.

Carlo Federico Jest, Church of the Gran Madre di Dio in Turin, 1839.
Fondazione Torino Musei-Galleria civica d’Arte Moderna (GAM).
The image is the very first known Italian outdoor daguerreotype example by an Italian daguerreotypist and is dated on the verso of the mount: October 8th, 1839. It presents the Neoclassic-style church of Gran Madre di Dio, located in front of Piazza Vittorio Veneto, at the western side of the bridge Vittorio Emanuele I. The church was inaugurated in 1831. Signed on the paper mat: "Jest à Turin". On the verso: "Dessin photographique d'après le procédé de M. Daguerre per Henri F. Jest opt., Mec. De l'Université R. Des Etudes à Turin rue Po N. 46"
A group of the first photographs ever taken in the UK (by a Frenchman, Monsieur de Sainte Croix) in September or October 1839:

The earliest surviving views of many places in Italy as shown in the Ellis daguerreotypes (many links on Daguerreobase). We also added Ellis’ notes as literature.

We published a group of unknown experimental daguerreotype plates that had been sensitised for the full spectrum - decades before Vogel's discovery of the first colour sensitizer in 1873.
We identified the first known photographs to have survived by photographer W F Thomas:

![Image of a grand house with glasshouses in the foreground alongside another small building.](image)

**Identification**
1920-610_1

**Image description**
A grand house with glass houses in the foreground alongside another small building.

**Tags**
House, glasshouse, trees, windows, doors, roofs, landscape, pediment, chimneys, balustrade, buildings

While the approved biography for William F. Thomas, at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York states:

*Thomas had mastered the daguerreotype process in 1845 and gone on to be a sewing machine manufacturer in London. When he died, the British Journal of Photography called him the “oldest amateur photographer in the United Kingdom.” None of his photographs are known to have survived.*

We have identified many persons on portraits and have been able to highlight important historical people. If you look on Wikipedia there is often no photograph of these people and they are therefore difficult to identify.

![Image of Caroline Chisholm](image)

**Caroline Chisholm**
Three quarter length portrait of a plump woman with a large lace (crocheted?) collar and silk shawl. The press cutting on the back refers to Mrs. Chisholm. Comparison with later printed portraits confirms she is the subject of the photograph. Caroline Chisholm was a humanitarian mostly known for her involvement with female immigrant welfare in Australia. She is regarded as a saint by the Church of England.
Composer Otto Nicolai
Thanks to Daguerreobase, an unspectacular portrait of a man with a moustache in the Albertina collection (FotoGLV2000/9872) could be identified as composer Otto Nicolai, best known for the opera “The Merry Wives of Windsor”, but better known as founder of the Viennese Philharmonic Orchestra. The collection of the Wien Museum houses an identified daguerreotype portrait of Mr. Nicolai from exactly the same photo shooting session (HMW 34146).

Portrait Marie Anna Leth von Lethenau
A private person browsed Daguerreobase and found an image of his ancestor Anna Leth von Lethenau by Lajos Kawalky in the Albertina collection (Foto2005/180). He pointed out that the young lady of no more than 25 years of age and so the person depicted in his daguerreotype most likely was not Ms Leth since Anna Leth should have been close to 60 years old at the time the daguerreotype was made. The name was therefore removed.

2. Dissemination
Daguerreotype 4-monthly Journal
Out of the five Daguerreotype Journals that have been produced, four editions were successfully released in the last project period. In all 40 articles have been written for the five journals, authored by consortium members as well as European and American specialists, amongst them:

- **Maria Francesca Bonetti**, curator at Instituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Italy, edited the catalogue *L'Italia d'argento: 1839-1859 : storia del dagherrotipo in Italia*
- **Margareth Calvarin**, curator of Musée Adrienne Mentienne, France
- **Keith F. Davis**, writer of *The Origins of American Photography: From Daguerreotype to Dry-Plate, 1839-1885*,
- **Ken Jacobson**, Photographic historian, United Kingdom, writer of the Carrying Off the Palaces: John Ruskin’s Lost Daguerreotypes
- **Martin Juergens**, conservator of photographs at the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- **Chiara Naldi**, University of Udine, Art History Department, Italy
- **Sean William Nolan**, writer of "Fixed in Time" a guide to dating early photographs such as Daguerreotypes, Ambrotypes, and early Tintypes
- **Alberto Prandi**, *Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia*, writer of many essays and curator of several photographic exhibitions, among the most recent *Storie d’argento 1989-1914. I 25 anni dell’Archivio Fotografico della Provincia di Treviso*
- **Araceli Sáez Pedrero**, writer of 1839: *La Divulgacion Publica de la Fotografia*
- **Steffen Siegel**, professor of theory and history of photography at Folkwang University of Art in Essen and writer of *Neues Licht, Daguerre, Talbot und die Veröffentlichung der Fotografie im Jahr 1839*
The Journal has a well-developed structure, which helps to find interesting articles, locate the specialist writers and make the journal attractive to the different target groups:

- **Editorial**
- **News**, covering new books, important events or interviews with professionals
- **Historical Notes**, articles describing historical facts related to the author of the image, the events represented in the image and/or the sociological context.
- **Science and daguerreotype**
- **Aesthetics**
- **Daguerreotype technology**, the historical process and the equipment or methods
- **Stories behind individual images**
- **Current research**

The response to the journal has been very positive, both within Europe and worldwide: readers include curators, conservators, collectors, members of the public, photographic dealers and, contemporary daguerreotypists. (Since we invite modern daguerreotypists to upload their work into Daguerreobase, the link to modern cultural heritage is very direct). The content of the articles is linked to the content of the database. We strive to link this information in both directions.

All five editions are available and downloadable on the ISSUU digital platform, on our website and on the EDA Facebook page.

Each number has been downloaded from the Issuu site between 500 and 600 times within the first month after publication. Unfortunately it is not possible to keep track of downloads after the first month or on the website and Facebook page.
The Virtual Exhibition

Conceiving the virtual exhibition 1839-1860, Photography on a silver plate was a pleasure, choosing images and writing texts gave deep insights on the material that was at time in our database. We chose the maximum format for a virtual exhibition: 81 images organised in 5 themes. The actual exhibition, online published in English and Italian is unfortunately much smaller: 26 images and only one third of the texts. Europeana refused to publish the complete exhibition since they had not yet harvested the material from Daguereobase. All images that were not part of the Europeana open content were excluded. The exhibition was rewritten to build on an interesting story. The exhibition garnered several press reviews and a radio interview.

We plan to publish the original exhibition to promote the database amongst the broad public.

The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015

On 8 and 9 October 2015 the international Daguerreotype Symposium and conservation workshop 2015 took place in the Hôtel de Malestroit in Bry-sur-Marne, France, where Louis Daguerre spent the last years of his life. Margareth Calvarin, curator of Musée Adrienne Mentiene, hosted the event.

More than 60 scholars, curators, conservators, media experts and opinion leaders in this field, came to examine the fascinating world of daguerreotypes, their digitization and preservation. The attending curators and conservators were especially interested in how to make this specific heritage relevant for a contemporary context.

The first day was dedicated to: Outside the Studio, Landscape and Cityscape Daguerreotypes The speakers showed their audience some outstanding examples of nineteenth century cityscape and landscape daguerreotype images - we tend to forget that in the early years of photography working outside the studio was extremely difficult - from private and institutional collections created by daguerreotypists such as John Ruskin, Joseph-Philibert Girault de Prangey and Daguerre himself, in addition to various other less known photographers. The historical and artistic content of the images as well the particular aesthetics of the outdoor daguerreotypes were examined and one of the speakers, the photographic historian Ken Jacobson, photographic historian, shared his remarkable discovery at a small country auction in 2006. One lightly regarded lot was a distressed mahogany box crammed with long-lost early photographs. These daguerreotypes were later confirmed as once belonging to John Ruskin, the great 19th-century art critic, writer, artist and social reformer. Moreover, the many scenes of Italy, France and Switzerland included the largest collection of daguerreotypes of Venice in the world and probably the earliest surviving photographs of the Alps.
The conservation and restoration of these unique items is an authentic challenge that involves the treatment of many complex materials. Each speaker had the opportunity to discuss how the recent scientific research is contributing to the progress underway in the specific field of conservation and restoration of daguerreotypes; the identification of the materials and processes that were used to create daguerreotypes, as well as our understanding of the various causes of deterioration. Professionals in the field of conservation and restoration, working in various European centres specializing in photography, presented well-documented case studies to illustrate the different strategies used to chemically and physically stabilize daguerreotypes in order to bring back their original appearance and structure.

Speakers: Steffen Siegel, professor of theory and history of photography at Folkwang University of Art in Essen, Jeremy Rowe, President of the Daguerreian Society, Christophe Maron, curator Musée Gruérien, Bulle, Switzerland, Beniamino Terraneo, contemporary daguerreotypist, Italy, Margareth Calvarin, Curator of Musée Adrienne Mentienne.

The second day focused on preserving Europe’s earliest photographs; challenges and successes in conserving daguerreotypes throughout Europe.


Combining history with conservation brought together a lot of important decision makers with regards to the publication of collections. The outcomes of the symposium were therefore not only the dissemination and sharing of knowledge and information and opening up to a broader public in order to discover and re-use daguerreotypes, but also the addition of a huge number of collections and records to Daguerreobase;

- Musée Adrienne Mentienne, Bry-sur Marne, contract signed on 9 October 69 records
- Musée Nicéphore Niépce (*inspired by Musée Adrienne Mentienne) 338 records
- Deutsches Museum, contract signed (Almost ingested) 317 records
- MKG, Hamburg (*inspired by Deutsches Museum) 693 records
- Private collection, Germany 26 records
- Martin Juergens, private collection 17 records
- Bibliotheken Universiteit Leiden - Bijzondere collecties (*inspired by Martin Juergens) 194 records
- Centre d’Iconographie de la Bibliothèque de Genève, (uploaded) 90 records
- Private collection, UK 7 records
- Private collection 54 records
- Private collection in Argentina (almost uploaded) 9 records
- Private collection in USA (almost uploaded) 8 records

(* not present at symposium, inspired by others who did attend the symposium)

The Belgian Embassy (General Representation of the Government of Flanders) in Paris, kindly offered a Welcome Drink to the organisers, speakers and a selection of the participants the evening prior to the symposium.

The Facebook page of EDA

The EDA Fb page proved to be a very useful tool in order to make the database known. Images and stories of particular collections or individual images were disseminated through Facebook and very well received. At the moment we have 800 followers, it is a community of people interested in early photography, many of them working in different fields related to this topic (as conservators, curators, archivists, historians, researchers, etc.). Posts are widely shared, by individuals and as well institutions Facebook’s page amongst ICOM-CC, The Daguerreian Society, Photography and Science, Early Photography, ARCP.
3. Sharing of knowledge

Researchers using Daguerreobase

Daguerreobase is now starting to be used by researchers in the way we hoped. We recently received an early draft of a paper examining the different housings for Beard patentee daguerreotypes. Richard Beard, UK’s ‘Mr Daguerreotype’ in the 1840s, owned the UK daguerreotype patent and sold licenses for professional use of the process. For the 1840s at least, licensees were obliged to label their daguerreotypes BEARD PATENTEE. Beard also sold them the housings, manufactured at his own factory. This paper creates a style chronology and hierarchy of costs for housings from basic to luxury. Being able to fit undated Beard patentee plates into a chronology is a great advance. Several of the images in the draft are taken straight from Daguerreobase. We have not carried out a survey of who is using Daguerreobase in their research so this paper, which we learnt of in a random way, is probably just one of many.

Last year a student of the Second Cycle Degree Programme in Chemical Science for Conservation and Restoration at the University of Ca’Foscari, Venice used Daguerreobase in her research. The database provided the student with very interesting visual examples of physical, chemical and biological alterations found on European and American daguerreotype plates and mountings. These examples were included in the thesis: “Non invasive diagnostic techniques applied on 19th century American daguerreotypes and experimental methods of atmospheric plasma cleaning”, a research dissertation written under the supervision of Prof. Paolo Ugo and co-supervised by Sandra M. Petrillo, which will be presented in March 2016.

The Photographic History Research Centre at De Montfort University includes Daguerreobase in their presentation to new students about important resources for photographic history.

http://www.dmu.ac.uk/research/research-faculties-and-institutes/art-design-humanities/phrc/photographic-history-research-centre-phrc.aspx

The National Media Museum refers, without exception, researchers on daguerreotypes to Daguerreobase.

We have not carried out a survey of who is using Daguerreobase in their research; these examples are probably just some of many.

Expected final results and the impact of Daguerreobase

The Daguerreobase approach combines best practice consensus building and awareness raising activities with the full-scale implementation of an infrastructure for digital image delivery and metadata dissemination.

*Working groups dedicated to specific problem domains (Standards description, terminologies and thesauri, long-term sustainability and IPR issues).*

Often a Daguerreotype is seen as an extraordinary but simple photographic image. The main description was given to the image itself. The so-called housing was often forgotten or seen as an obstacle that obstructs the visibility and access to the photographic image. If we had described daguerreotypes this way, it would not have done justice to the wealth of information that a daguerreotype with its housing has. The description of metadata was therefore precise and time-consuming work.

To come to the best possible metadata description, the expertise of a broad and varied group was essential; the consortium is a strategic mix of institutional, technical and private partners. They are all experts in their field. They have shared and combined their knowledge, skills and experience, resulting in two formats, available for the database: the extended and the smaller format. This turned out to be a good approach and in the end it was worthwhile spending much time on this fundamental step. The database is equipped for the future, users can quickly enter and see the principal data, later they can zoom in, and add details.
The consortium partners, shared information with each other on best practise in collections, what are the do’s and don’ts, and have spread this knowledge and information with professionals and interested laymen.

Daguerreobase created standards for the description and digitization of daguerreotype objects facilitating the uniform description of the daguerreotype objects.

And Daguerreobase developed a multilingual set of thesauri specifically for daguerreotypes, to enable the comparison of descriptions in different languages as well.

Collect available knowledge and information on the preservation and the management of the Daguerreotype.

Research by literature
The ingested literature is a unique source for research; it contains 9,710 pages with primary and secondary literature from the Daguerreian era and shortly after (<1839 – ca. 1875).
Subjects are mainly daguerreotype photography related, but also include technical and historical topics (chemistry, physics, optics, daguerreotypists, improvements, presentation forms and formats, other developments, trade labels etc.). Information about new discoveries or other contemporary photographic techniques are also incorporated, to give context to the development of early photography and the decision, those days, to go for reproducible techniques, resulting in the dawn of the daguerreotype.
The literature is offered in the same structure as the daguerreotype objects on the website. In Memorix Maior a separate entity for literature is available. The literature can be consulted, searched and downloaded, as a PDF document combination with an image of the front page. There is one document for each article or book. The required descriptive information is based on the Dublin Core metadata set, so you can search the texts using keywords.

Realise a broad international consensus-building network, involving national museums, archives and libraries as well as private owners, collectors and research centres and experts.
The main result of this project is the network that has been created. More than 300 institutions and individuals have contributed to Daguerreobase. The fact that these daguerreotypes come from so many sources has been one of the biggest difficulties and at the same time one of the greatest assets of the project. The consortium partners did not just have to convince one or two large institutions to do their part, but they had to convince dozens of organizations and individuals, and with all of them, big or small, they had to make contracts, transfer the material into an ingestible format and had to import the files into the database. That was an immense amount of work.
But, this network turned out to be and will be our best tool to convince others to put their daguerreotype in our database, by collecting and describing we understand what is still there; this is essential for the conservation of these vulnerable objects. The interest shown by an outside body often helps to draw attention to these sometimes-neglected treasures. The network snowball was not rolling immediately, but now it rolls it is unstoppable.

And the network is a worldwide network. Recently a curator at Auckland Museum in New Zealand Shaun Higgins, shared his French daguerreotype by L.A. Bisson in the collection.
http://www.aucklandmuseum.com/collection/object/am_library-photography-69348
He found Daguerreobase through http://britishphotohistory.ning.com/ and a link from the photography museum in Helsinki whilst looking at another photography related item. Most of their daguerreotypes are from New Zealand (where they are quite rare) but there are also examples of daguerreotypes that were brought with immigrants, or collected (such as the one he mentions). The collector (MacKelvie) bought this plate in 1854 and attributed to Daguerre, 1939, however the plate has Bisson on it.

He wrote us, after we asked him to share this information to the database:
Yes I’d love to share it through the database. I thought it would be of interest to European scholars/collectors to know of such an example that made its way across the world. I can arrange for images showing both sides.
It is interesting to note the 1885 catalogue from the collector who owned this daguerreotype attributed it to Daguerre. I’ll do some more research on this as I want to try and find out what happened to the second one mentioned in his catalogue:
Catalogue of the MacKelvie Collection, for Auckland, New Zealand. 1885.

836 Original Daguerreotype of “The Mint, Paris,” by Daguerre, 1839. From the “Stokes” collection, sold in 1854. The French Government granted Daguerre an annuity of 6,000 francs for this discovery. A silvered plate was exposed to the fumes of iodine and thus rendered sensitive to light. The latent image was then brought out by exposure to the fumes of mercury.


The daguerreotype has L.A. Bisson’s label advertisement on the verso (adhered to the backing paper), which is why it is now attributed to Bisson rather than Daguerre. In terms of other daguerreotypes most of the daguerreotypes in New Zealand are late by comparison dating to the 1850s.

I’ve been researching daguerreotypes in the collection (with a particular interest in establishing locally made examples). I’ve written a couple of papers on the topic, which are pending publication shortly.

For every curator or collector who writes there may be 100 who don’t. This e-mail is very much the ‘tip of the iceberg’. Daguerreobase will ingest these daguerreotypes announce and share Higgins publications.

The consortium partners realised that the outcome of the project and the project itself have brought them various benefits:

- Museum Ludwig in Cologne rediscovered parts of their collection and also found non-registered daguerreotypes. ‘Daguerreobase is a door opener for the visibility of collections and research’.
- The National Bibliotek in Norway found their national as their international network greatly enhanced. Through Daguerreobase they gained further insight into collections and found out who the actual experts are. Furthermore the project has been educational for the institutions themselves, they learned how to handle, describe and bring daguerreotypes to the attention of the public.
- Nicolas Burnett (MCS) has enlarged his network; he was asked to provide conservation training and received some commissions as a result of this project. He identified, and still is identifying, daguerreotype collections (Great Britain in the age of the daguerreotype had the highest per capita income of any country in the world (Bairoch, Paul (1976): "Europe's Gross National Product: 1800–1975", Journal of European Economic History, Vol. 5, pp. 273–340). The country has not been fought over since that time though it was bombed. In consequence there are still lots of daguerreotypes to be found.) He sees a lot of potential research projects, some of them already started, others in an advanced state.
- The NTM in Prague has studied the collection of NTM more intensively. They have a better understanding of the importance of their collection on a national and international level.
- The Finnish Museum of Photography enlarged their contacts and network with neighbouring countries (Baltic countries, Russia, Sweden), with European colleagues and members of Daguerreobase project. The project resulted in increased interest in, and respect for daguerreotypes in other museums and archives, when they had to catalogue, check the condition and photograph their daguerreotypes.
- One of the findings was a better view of daguerreotypes existing in Finland; and a depressing knowledge about their poor condition on average. They will use the knowledge and the images for writing an application for grants to fund a national conservation project for saving Finnish daguerreotypes.
- IPR in Austria sees the deepening of existing network connections (museums, curators, collectors) as one of the most valuable outcomes of the project besides new contacts Europe-wide to the members of the Daguerreobase consortium.
- SMP in Italy was able to publish in the database daguerreotypes owned by private collectors which were never published in books before. Daguerreotypes made by Italian daguerreotypist are very rare, thanks to Daguerreobase it is now possible to see and read about several interesting examples.

The invitation of Martin Juergens of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, to contribute to the ICOM meeting with Daguerreobase as subject, speaks for itself:

Is there anyone who could give a talk about Daguerreobase at the upcoming ICOM-CC Photographic Materials Working Group Interim Meeting (Rijksmuseum, 21-24 Sept. 2016)? I think this would be great idea, since I can imagine that a number of non-European participants may not know Daguerreobase well, and since your work on this project has been so very successful! Please give it some thought, but not too long, since the deadline for the Call for Papers is January 15!
This essentially shows how useful this website has become, also to non-Europeans! And of course we have accepted this invitation. The title of the presentation is Daguerreotypes: Sharing Unique Objects on www.Daguerreobase.org

Daguerreobase has been collaborating with Europeana and other projects, from day one, in order to avoid overlap, to identify synergies and to maximise the impact of the ICT-PSP programme. Once we started ingesting the material, we had a nice personal contact and very professional relation with Europeana. It was a complex procedure to get all information ingested into their database; Europeana helped and advised and was open to comments from our side. They also were very quickly to process the data, it was done on demand and we got good feedback on possible errors.

Discussion points and solutions with Europeana:
Europeana stated: All content that is in the public domain must be labelled accordingly by applying the Public Domain Mark. Works that are labelled as being in the public domain can be used by anyone without any restrictions. All images that are 70 year and older are in the public domain. There still is a huge information gap on copyright and PDM labels in Europe. Laws on copyright are furthermore not equally applied in all European countries. Daguerreobase suffered from the lack of expertise of the content providers in this field. The small institutes often do not have the knowledge to deal with copyrights, simply because they do not have the staff with this expertise. Besides that, they do have to take care of the original material, which is often very vulnerable and precious. Reluctance to place images in the public domain is the main reason why some collections do want to share their images. They may not have a copyright but they do have a veto. The PDM specification of Europeana was not a demand from the very start; along the way the demands and requirements were changed, we therefore had to go back to all content providers to discuss PDM ingestion with them. We have solved this problem in various ways:

1. We used the exceptions that some countries use: jurisprudence on non-original photograph protection. This was possible since Daguerreotypes must be seen as complex 3 dimensional objects that can only be digitised by human operators who have the technical knowledge to photograph daguerreotypes.
2. We have split the rights for the Daguerreobase and for Europeana in Memorix Maior. This was in the beginning very confusing for Europeana but has been accepted. Records that were problematic are shown in Europeana as thumbnails or with a watermark. In Daguerreobase they are displayed as often as possible as a high-resolution image with the Creative Commons/copyright label the provider has chosen.
3. There are collections published on the Daguerreobase website that will not be available in Europeana. Some will be provided through other aggregators who have other agreements with Europeana since their records were already ingested.

Another issue that has not been fully addressed is that Daguerreobase as aggregator is listed as the content provider on Europeana. However, institutions and custodians want to be mentioned as the owners of the work, understandably for the exposure of their own collection. In the coming months, Daguerreobase will work with Europeana on a solution for this issue.

Achievements
Daguerreobase has delivered a standard for the description and the preservation of the daguerreotype objects. Daguerreobase has delivered a standard for the high quality digitisation of daguerreotype objects (workflow, digitization parameters, documentation of the digitisation).
A multilingual set of thesauri has been developed for the description of daguerreotype objects.
The Daguerreobase Portal (www.daguerreobase.org), works as a knowledge base that will improve the preservation and the management of this unique part of Europe’s first photographic heritage. This knowledge base includes best practices, guidelines and tools.
Daguerreobase has proven and will proof to be a metadata aggregator for historical and contemporary daguerreotypes that interoperates with Europeana and is complementary to Europeana. And can even easily be used for other techniques in photography, such as glass negatives, ambrotypes and tintypes. Daguerreobase improved the quality of the content, the metadata and the service delivery through sharing best practices in metadata harmonisation, digital management, digital archiving, web service deliveries logistics (locate/request/deliver), re-use of content, digitisation and the creation of an online user manual, thesauri (or lists) and informative booklets in the major European languages - English, French, German, Italian, Polish, Spanish - and three other languages, Finnish, Norwegian and Czech. Daguerreobase developed software tools for aggregation of daguerreotypes and daguerreotype related objects, all released as open source. Daguerreobase realised engagement of the photography and heritage community through awareness-raising by its partners for the large public, sharing best practice and by offering support and access to the BPN-facilities. Daguerreobase founded The European Daguerreotype Association (EDA). Daguerreobase developed an extended and interesting Europeana virtual exhibition. Parts of it have not been showed yet; daguerreobase and Europeana are in negotiation to launch these parts of the exhibition at a later time.

Contact details:
Project Coordinator:
FotoMuseum Provincie Antwerpen
Waalse Kaai 47
2000 Antwerp - Belgium
tel: +32 (0)3 242 93 00
Ann Deckers
Ann.Deckers@fomu.be

Sabine Cauberghs
Sabine.Cauberghs@fomu.be

http://www.daguerreobase.org

"Daguerreobase is partially funded under the ICT Policy Support Programme (ICT PSP) as part of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme by the European Community".
http://ec.europa.eu/ict_psp

“This publication only reflects the author's views. The European Community is not liable for any use that might be made of the information contained therein”indicated
1. Project objectives for the period

General objectives

In 1839 the daguerreotype process was announced. This was the first successful photographic process in the history of photography and the world. Daguerreotypes can therefore be seen as the ‘Incunabula of Photography’. Photography has fundamentally changed our way of looking at the world; the daguerreotype was therefore the start of imaging the rich visual culture we embrace today.

Daguerreobase is a public platform of archives, libraries, museums and private contributors from across Europe. Members can store, view and edit records of individual daguerreotypes with their housings and establish relations to other records. It is a unique research tool, not only for scientists, but also for collectors, photographers, the general public, historians, curators and many others.

Though the digital image is not the object itself, in aggregate they help us understand what we are looking at. We are able to compare, collate and build understanding of this important medium from the beginning of photography. By pooling digital images we enrich our collective daguerreotype heritage. This helps to highlight the significance of the original objects and thus the importance of preserving those originals. At the same time, this heritage will only come to live if we manage to decode them and explain old values from the past to make them relevant for contemporary contexts.

Period 3 was, after the second review, extended with 6 months, this report therefore covers the last 16 months of the project.

The general objectives of the Daguerreobase are for the entire project:

- To aggregate high quality images and descriptions of mainly European daguerreotypes and daguerreotype related objects;
- To enable access to at least 75% of the still existing, highly significant but scattered institutional and private daguerreotype collections in Europe via Europeana;
- To enhance the quality of both new and existing Europeana content, in terms of its metadata richness, its re-use potential and its uniqueness;
- To enable improved search, retrieval and use of Europeana content, both within the Europeana portal and by third parties via the Europeana API.

Linked to the general objectives the objectives for period 3 are:

Submission of the following deliverables (excluding D1.2 First periodic report including financial statement)

- WP1: D1.4 Final Project report and D1.5 Final Financial report
- WP2: D2.4 Daguerreotype 4-monthly Journal; and D2.5 Europeana Virtual Daguerreotype Exhibition
- WP3: No deliverables to submit
• WP4: no deliverables planned in period 3. But since no response had came on D4.3 reports of acceptance testing, D4.5 Web services and functionality Report we have resubmitted them in Period 3.
• WP5: D5.7 Content aggregation
• WP6: submit D6.2.3, D6.2.4, D 6.2.5
• WP7: D7.4. Daguerreobase Business Model and Plan

Organise the following milestones

Milestone 6, MS6 PMB 6, host NTM
Milestone 7, MS7 Final Meeting and PMB, host NFM

Milestone 8, MS8, Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop, originally planned in period 1 had been postponed due to several circumstances and was organised in period 3.
2. Work progress and achievements during the period

Work package 1: Project Management

MS6 BPN 6, host NTM 21 January 2014
This consortium and board meeting was organised in period 2 in relation to the Awareness Raising Meeting in Prague. We refer to D1.3 Second Periodic report for more details about of this meeting.

At this meeting the new website costumed entry form was presented and accepted by the consortium.

MS7 Final meeting and PMB7, host NFM

The PMB-meeting was held on December 2nd, the complete board was present, except Picturae, who informed in time about legitimate personal reasons why they could not be present. The Technical Review meeting took place on December 3rd, assisted by the entire consortium (except Picturae). Both meetings were held at NFM as planned.

The last two Review reports stated the following recommendation:
R5. It is recommended to avoid spending resources on additional activities that detract from the core objectives of the project.
In period 3 the coordinator demanded the consortium to focus on WP5 content aggregation and to use WP2 activities and instruments (journal, exhibition, symposium) to reach the WP5 targets. Another point of focus in this period was the Business Model.

R6. It is strongly recommended to clarify the financial foundation, bring financial reporting to a stable level and set up a rigorous resource monitoring. The costs of the various efforts need to be completely transparent.
FoMu deployed even more strict actions concerning resource monitoring for all of the beneficiaries. As announced in period 2 the coordinator took action with regard to partner Technische Sammlungen Dresden that limped behind in results. TSD respected a maximum cost claim that is in equilibrium with the content they will deliver (1000 to 1300 objects).

Due to the extended period, e-DAVID had to focus on other assignments that belong to the core of their business. With regard to WPL7 e-DAVID an agreement was made that they would return 10 p/m to the consortium. FOMU took over the responsibility for the D7.4 Daguerrrobase Business Model and Plan.
Work package 2: Awareness, dissemination and networking activities

General objectives of WP2 according to the DoW:

WP2 includes the awareness, dissemination and networking activities of the project. The activities described in this work package will result in multilingual information on how to participate in a European network, supported by Europeana, and how to recognise the daguerreotype medium. The aim of this work package is to:

- Create awareness of the benefits of making information and descriptions available on a European level, as well from private as from institutional collections, resulting in an increased number of qualitative descriptions and digitally available historical resources.
- Create opportunities and a European forum for the further development of the project.
- Increase the number of partners of the consortium resulting in a more widespread network, covering all parts of Europe.

Since 1 April 2014 SMP is WP2 leader.

WP2-objectives for period 3

D2.4 Daguerreotype 4-monthly Journal, editions 2,3,4
D2.5 Europeana Virtual Daguerreotype Exhibition
MS8 Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop (originally planned in period 1)

Work progress and achievements WP2

As mentioned in D1.4 Second Periodic Report the project was confronted with a serious delay, caused by a change in WP2-leadership, especially with regard to the Daguerreotype 4-monthly Journal and the Europeana Virtual daguerreotype Exhibition. Also a very important milestone ‘Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop (MS6) had been postponed.

D2.4. Daguerreotype Four-monthly journal

Out of the five Daguerreotype journals that have been produced, four editions were successfully released in the last project period. In all 40 articles have been written for the five journals, authored by consortium members as well as European and American specialists, amongst them:

- **Maria Francesca Bonetti**, curator at Instituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Italy, edited the catalogue *L'Italia d'argento: 1839-1859: storia del dagherrotipo in Italia*
- **Margareth Calvarin**, curator of Musée Adrienne Mentienne, France
- **Keith F. Davis**, writer of *The Origins of American Photography: From Daguerreotype to Dry-Plate, 1839-1885.*
- **Ken Jacobson**, Photographic historian, United Kingdom, writer of the Carrying Off the Palaces: John Ruskin’s Lost Daguerreotypes
- **Martin Juergens**, conservator of photographs at the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- **Chiara Naldi**, University of Udine, Art History Department, Italy
- **Sean William Nolan**, writer of “Fixed in Time” a guide to dating early photographs such as Daguerreotypes, Ambrotypes, and early Tintypes
• Alberto Prandi, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia, writer of many essays and curator of several photographic exhibitions, among the most recent Storie d'argento 1989-1914. I 25 anni dell'Archivio Fotografico della Provincia di Treviso

• Araceli Sáez Pedrero, writer of 1839: La Divulgacion Publica de la Fotografia

• Steffen Siegel, professor of theory and history of photography at Folkwang University of Art in Essen and writer of Neues Licht, Daguerre, Talbot und die Veröffentlichung der Fotografie im Jahr 1839
The Journal has a well-developed structure, which helps to find interesting articles, locate the specialist writers and make the journal attractive to the different target groups:

- **Editorial**
- **News**, covering new books, important events or interviews with professionals
- **Historical Notes**, articles describing historical facts related to the author of the image, the events represented in the image and/or the sociological context.
- **Science and daguerreotype**
- **Aesthetics**
- **Daguerreotype technology**, the historical process and the equipment or methods
- **Stories behind individual images**
- **Current research**

The response to the journal has been very positive, both within Europe and worldwide: readers include curators, conservators, collectors, members of the public, photographic dealers and, contemporary daguerreotypists. (Since we invite modern daguerreotypists to upload their work into Daguerreobase, the link to modern cultural heritage is very direct). The content of the articles is linked to the content of the database. We strive to link this information in both directions.

All five editions are available and downloadable on the ISSUU digital platform, on our website and on the EDA Facebook page.

Each number has been downloaded from the Issuu site between 500 and 600 times within the first month after publication. Unfortunately it is not possible to keep track of downloads after the first month or on the website and Facebook page.

Conceiving the virtual exhibition 1839-1860, *Photography on a silver plate* was a pleasure, choosing images and writing texts gave deep insights on the material that was at time in our database. We chose the maximum format for a virtual exhibition: 81 images organised in 5 themes. The actual exhibition, online published in English and Italian is unfortunately much smaller: 26 images and only one third of the texts. Europeana refused to publish the complete exhibition since they had not yet harvested the material from Daguerreobase. All images that were not part of the Europeana open content were excluded. The exhibition was rewritten to build on an interesting story. The exhibition garnered several press reviews and a radio interview.

We plan to publish the original exhibition to promote the database amongst the broad public.
Milestone 8 (MS6) – The Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop/
The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015

In period 1 a Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop was planned. Due to several issues the Conservation and Daguerreotype Workshop got postponed to period 2. Four successful awareness-raising meetings were organised in period 2. The new WP2-leader also started working on the 4-monthly Journal. Once again the Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop was postponed to the next project period (3).

ARCP had been organising an Awareness Raising Meeting in Paris (which was originally planned in Rumania) and was unable to host the Conservation Workshop, but offered network assistance.

WP2-leader and the coordinator joined forces together to organise this important milestone. A Conservation Workshop in the strict sense of the word appeared to be too limited; one can only allow a handful of people to ‘work’ in a space. It was decided to organise a two-day-symposium in Bry-sur-Marne, the place where Daguerre spent the last years of his life. In museums and archives the historians are usually very influential when it comes to the disclosure of collections. So we thought it was imperative to create a symposium not only for the photographic conservators, but also for the historians. That is why we organised two days of symposium with distinguished speakers from Europe and the USA.

The first day was dedicated to: Outside the Studio, Landscape and Cityscape Daguerreotypes and focused on all material that has been made outside the studio. We tend to forget that in the early years of photography working outside the studio was extremely difficult. The second day focused on preservation on Europe’s earliest photographs, challenges and successes in conserving daguerreotypes throughout Europe.

The Belgian Embassy (General Representation of the Government of Flanders) in Paris, kindly offered a Welcome Drink to the organisers, speakers and a selection of the participants the evening prior to the symposium.

Wednesday October 7, 19h-20.30h – VIP Welcome Drink
Belgian Embassy – General Representation of the Government of Flanders (Paris)

Thursday October 8, 9.30h – 17h
Outside the Studio, Landscape and Cityscape daguerreotypes

- Margaret Calvarin : curator at the Musée Adrienne Mentienne in Bry-sur-Marne (France)
- Jennifer Booth, Museum and Conservation Liaison International (UK)
- Ken Jacobson : photographic historian, collector and photographic art dealer (K&J Jacobson) (UK)
- Steffen Siegel : photographic historian teaching at Folkwang University of Art in Essen (Germany)
- Jeremy Rowe: president of the Daguerreian Society and Sr Research Scientist, New York University (US)
- Christophe Mauron : curator at Musée Gruérien, Bulle (CH)
- Beniamino Terraneo : contemporary daguerreotypist in (Italy)
- Visit to the church of St-Gervais - et-St Protais in Bry-sur-Marne
Friday October 9, 9.30h – 16 h
Preserving Europe’s earliest photographs,
Challenges and successes in conserving daguerreotypes throughout Europe

- Martin Juergens: Photographic Conservator, Rijksmuseum Amsterdam (NL)
- Klaus Pollmeier: independent Photographic Conservator (Fine Print Studios, Mulheim a.d. Ruhr, Germany)
- Caroline Barcella, Atelier BoBu, Paris (FR)
- Sandra M. Petrillo: independent Photographic Conservator based (SMP Photoconservation), Italy
- Jérôme Monnier: independent Photographic Conservator working in France (Atelier Etex, Paris)
- Jens Gold, Photographic Conservator at Preus Museum Oslo (NO)
- Clara M. Prieto: independent Photographic Conservator working professor at ESCRBC (Superior School of Conservation-Restauration of Cultural heritage) Madrid, Spain.

Participants were also offered free admission to the exhibition ‘Les dags sortent de leur reserve’ at the Maison Daguerre which was curated by host and guest speaker Margaret Calvarin. In the symposium-bag a printed version of the online Daguerreotype Journal dedicated to the conference was offered together with a DVD ‘Le Diorama de Bry-sur-Marne. Une restauration singulière’, a film by Jean-Louis Berdot.

A registration fee of 165 euros was asked (85,00 euros for students) to cover a part of the costs and TruVue sponsored the printing of the Daguerreotype Journal that was offered to the symposium participants.

As you can see in the participant list further below, participants came from France, UK (Fox Talbot Museum), Denmark (Royal Library), Germany (Deutsches Museum), Estland, USA (J. Paul Getty Museum, DeGolyer Library), and other countries.

Above left: f.l.t.r. Klaus Pollmeier, Anne Peterson, Philippe D’havé (Belgian Embassy) and Jens Gold.

Above right: Jeremy Rowe and Ken Jacobson

Carlos Vertanessian and Margaret Calvarin

Steffen Siegel and Sandra Maria Petrillo

Hans Gummersbach and Sabine Cauberghs

Sillamaa Vilja and Agnes Wijers

Pictures by Carlos Vertanessian and Sabine Cauberghs
The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015 – Day 1
Outside the Studio. Landscape and cityscape daguerreotypes

Agnes Wijers
Margaret Calvarin with translator
Ken Jacobson

Steffen Siegel
Jeremy Rowe

Chritophe Mauron assisted by Agnes and Jeremy
Beniamino Terraneo

Pictures by Carlos Vertanessian and Sabine Cauberghs
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The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015 – Day 2

Martin Jürgens, Jens Gold and Jérôme Monnier answering questions posed by the audience.

Sandra Petrillo and Clara M. Prieto

Stéphanie Ledamoisal

Studying the samples brought by Jens Gold
Left picture: Laura Sallas, Martin Jürgens, Klaus Pollmeier and Patrick Demaret
Right picture: Dr. Cornelia Kemp and Steffen Siegel
The exhibition ‘Les dags sortent de leur reserve (Maison Daguerre).

The Daguerreotype Symposium gift bag.
**List of participants of the Daguerreotype Symposium 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institute, Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agardi Attila</td>
<td>Daguerretypist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arribas Angels</td>
<td>Lumen Photographic Conservation, Photograph Conservator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcella Caroline</td>
<td>Atelier Boba, Photographic Conservator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Björkert Ulrika</td>
<td>Stockholms Stadsmuseum, Paper &amp; Photo conservator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth Jennifer</td>
<td>Tru Vue, Inc. Museum and Conservation Liaison International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borysková Štěpánka</td>
<td>Film and TV School of Academy of Performing Arts in Prague, pedagogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulat Elena</td>
<td>Weissman Preservation Center/Harvard Library, Photograph Conservator for Special Collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvarin Margaret</td>
<td>Musée Adrienne Mentiene, Curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carstensen Grylle</td>
<td>The Royal Library, Conservator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassinari Davide</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauberghs Sabine</td>
<td>FotoMuseum Antwerpen/Daguerrebase, Project Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleynhens Nathalie</td>
<td>FotoMuseum Antwerpen, Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Polo Gabriella</td>
<td>Fratelli Alinari IDEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delepaule Nathalie</td>
<td>Bry-sur-Marne, 1ere adjointe et représentante du maire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desveaux Delphine</td>
<td>Parisienne de Photographie, Roger-Viollet collections manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kemp Cornelia</td>
<td>Deutsches Museum, Curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman Sarah</td>
<td>J. Paul Getty Museum, Associate Conservator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gajewska Barbara</td>
<td>Academy of Performing Arts in Prague – FAMU student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHESQUIERE Jérôme</td>
<td>MNAAGuimet, In charge of the photographic collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Jens</td>
<td>Preus Museum, Photographic Conservator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gummersbach Hans EDA-Board member, EDA-Board member
Harnly Marc J. Paul Getty Museum, Photographic Conservator
Huťková Anna Academy of performing arts – FAMU, student
Jacobson Ken K&J Jacobson Photographic Historian, collector and dealer
Juergens Martin Rijksmuseum Amsterdam Photographic Conservator
Klein Simone Sotheby's, Head of Department, Europe - Photographs
Lambrecxts Wouter KdG university college/EDA Board member Teacher/EDA Board member
Ledamosel Stéphanie ARCP/Ville de Paris, Photographic Conservator
Lefort Mathilde Médiathèque Jules Verne Directrice
Lesenská Lenka Academy of performing arts – FAMU, student
Mandula Aleth Palais de Tokyo
Mauron Christophe Musée gruíérien Curator
Maynés Pau Institut National du Patrimoine Professeur
Monnier Jérôme Atelier Etex Photographic Conservator
Murakami Hanako Paris 8 university Doctorate student
Norén Catrin The Royal Library, Conservator
Odelhall Mariann Stockholms stadsmuseum, Curator
Patrick Demaret Fonds Louis Daguerre
Peterson Anne E. DeGolyer Library, SMU Curator of Photographs
Pettrillo Sandra M. SMP Photoconservation/Daguerreobase, Photographic Conservator
Pollmeier Klaus Fine Print Studios (Mülheim a.d. Ruhr), Photographic Conservator
Porkkala Jalo ESCRBC Madrid Photographic Conservator and Professor
Reynaud Françoise Musée Carnavalet Histoire de Paris curator/conservatrice département photographies
Riess Lionel Institut National du Patrimoine, student
Riou Antonin Conservator of photographs
Rottmeier-Keß Christine Münchener Stadtmuseum Conservator
Rowe Jeremy Daguerreian Society, Director
Saez Araceli Musée Adrienne Mentienne, Attachée de Conservation
Sallas Laura The Finnish Museum of Photography/Daguerreobase Conservator
Schlosser Georges Médiathèque Jules Verne
Schmidt Marjen Conservator
Schulze Sigrid Photohistorian / Curator photohistorian / curator
Siegel Steffen Folkwang Universität der Künste, Essen, Photographic Historian and Professor
Sillamaa Vilja Conservation Centre kanutconservator (Estonia)
Sirven Marsha ARCP Head of conservation section
Sørensen Hanne Karin The Royal Library, Conservator
Spilbauer Jean-Pierre Bry-sur-Marne Maire
Stewart Lindsey Bernard Quaritch Limited, Consultant Specialist in photographs
Terraneo Beniamino Contemporary daguerreotypist, Contemporary daguerreotypist
Terraneo-Bozzi Natalina
Tonelli Elvira La Fototeca sas manager
Vertanessian Carlos Collector – Historian Collector - Historian
Visschedijk Ruud Nederlands Fotomuseum director
Watson Roger Fox Talbot Museum Curator
Wijers Agnes FotoMuseum Antwerpen/Daguerreobase Project Coordination Daguerreobase
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The outcome of the symposium

Combining history with conservation brought together a lot of important decision makers with regard to the publication of collections. The outcomes of the symposium were therefore not only the dissemination and sharing of knowledge and information and opening up to a broader public in order to discover and re-use daguerreotypes, but also the addition of a huge number of collections and records to Daguerreobase:

- Musée Adrienne Mentienne, Bry-sur-Marne, contract signed on 9 October 69 records
- Musée Nicéphore Niépce (*inspired by Musée Adrienne Mentienne) 338 records
- Deutsches Museum, contract signed (Almost ingested) 317 records
- MKG, Hamburg (*inspired by Deutsches Museum) 693 records
- Private collection, Germany 26 records
- Martin Juergens, private collection 17 records
- Bibliotheken Universiteit Leiden - Bijzondere collecties (*inspired by Martin Juergens) 194 records
- Centre d’Iconographie de la Bibliothèque de Genève, (uploaded) 90 records
- Private collection, UK 7 records
- Private collection 54 records
- Private collection in Argentina (almost uploaded) 9 records
- Private collection in USA (almost uploaded) 8 records

(* not present at symposium, inspired by others who did attend the symposium)

Here are some reactions after the symposium:

“Congratulations on a very smooth, meaningful meeting. I’m so glad I was able to attend.” Mark Harnly, J. Paul Getty Museum, USA

“I enjoyed the conference very much, both meeting old (and new) colleagues, learning about their recent work - and about dagerreobase! The choice of Bry as the conference’s location was really charming. Thank you for that.” Sigrid Schulze, photo historian and curator.

Thank you for having organised such a wonderful symposium!!! I was sooo happy to attend, even if it was only for one day. It was fantastic!! Simone Klein, Sotheby’s

Thank you for the wonderful symposium on Daguerre. It was most interesting and beautifully organized! Aleth Mandula, Musée Picasso Paris.
Working package 3: best practice and standards description

**General objectives of WP3 according to DoW**

WP 3 includes best practice consensus building tasks and aims to:
- Establish a best practice with a shared vision on the proposed digital resources and conceptual models and to reach a consensus on the large-scale implementation activities and achieve a successful project result in general;
- Ensure that all participants’ expertise will be improved to a same level of knowledge and understanding;
- Identify the most appropriate metadata model for Europeana, agree on the outlining process to establish and integrate the chosen model into Europeana, and adopt the model for the general descriptive metadata;
- Establish an appropriate set of community metadata standards for the description of daguerreotype objects;
- Establish an appropriate community standard for the digitization process of daguerreotype objects including imaging and preservation modalities;
- Implement a set of existing/modified or newly developed multilingual thesauri or entries list for the description of daguerreotype objects.

The WP3 Leader was initially TSD and is now PIM.

**Objectives of WP3 for period 2 according to DoW**

According to the DoW no deliverables had to be submitted in period 3.
Work package 4: renewed Daguerreobase and service delivery

General objectives of Work Package 4 according to the DoW

WP 4 will include all tasks related to the renewal of the existing Daguerreobase to:
- Provide a suitable infrastructure for a metadata aggregator for historical and contemporary daguerreotypes that:
  - Is complementary and interoperates with Europeana
  - Will enable access to a critical amount of descriptions of significant cultural heritage
  - Will enhance the quality of new and existing content for Europeana
  - Will enable improved search ability and retrieve ability
  - Will improve semantic interoperability, multilingual and cross-language searching
  - Will improve services
Input from all partners is required on the structure and functionality of the Daguerreobase platform.

The WP4 leader is PIM.

WP4-objectives for period 3 according to DoW

No deliverables were planned in Period 3. But work has been done on two more deliverables that according to our information weren’t approved yet.

D4.3 Reports of acceptance testing of Daguerreobase
D4.5 Web services and functionality report

Work progress and achievements WP4

The first versions of these deliverables were written by eDAVID, but Boudewijn Ridder from NFM has done additional testing and rewrote these deliverables accordingly.

Picturae has been spending hours onproblem solving related to the ingestion in the Daguerreobase-portal.

Daguerreobase has proven and will proof to be a metadata aggregator for historical and contemporary daguerreotypes that interoperates with Europeana and is complementary to Europeana. And can even easily be used for other techniques in photography, such as glass negatives, ambrotypes and tintypes.

Daguerreobase improved the quality of the content, the metadata and the service delivery through sharing best practices in metadata harmonisation, digital management, digital archiving, web service deliveries logistics (locate/request/deliver), re-use of content, digitisation and the creation of an online user manual, thesauri (or lists) and informative booklets in the major European languages - English, French, German, Italian, Polish, Spanish - and three other languages, Finnish, Norwegian and Czech.

Daguerreobase has delivered a standard for the description and the preservation of the daguerreotype objects.

Daguerreobase has delivered a standard for the high quality digitisation of daguerreotype objects (workflow, digitization parameters, documentation of the digitisation).

A multilingual set of thesauri has been developed for the description of daguerreotype objects.
The Daguerreobase Portal (www.daguerreobase.org), works as a knowledge base that will improve the preservation and the management of this unique part of Europe’s first photographic heritage. This knowledge base includes best practices, guidelines and tools.
Work package 5: Content aggregation and aligning with Europeana

General objectives of WP5 according to the DoW

Activities described in WP5 have to result in an increased number of high quality descriptions of daguerreotypes and related objects in the Daguerreobase platform and the Europeana portal. The Daguerreobase platform will bring together the technical infrastructure and technical expertise and knowledge on daguerreotypes, to exchange and interoperate within the Europeana platform. Realising the objectives is depending on the outcomes of:
WP 2 Awareness raising, dissemination and networking activities.
WP 3 Best practice and standards descriptions.
WP 4 Renewed Daguerreobase and service delivery
Close liaison with WP6 Project performance and project evaluation.

The WP5 leader is NFM.

WP5-objectives for period 3 according to the DoW

Deliverables
D5.7 Content aggregation

Work progress and achievements WP5

The Second Review report stated the following recommendation:
R2. It is strongly recommended to sign the Europeana Agreement without delay

The contract with Europeana was signed by Jill Cousins, Executive Director of European, on June 27, 2014 and signed by Elviera Velghe, director FOMU, on July 4, 2014. An amount of 10.000 euros was paid by FOMU on July 17, 2014.

Content aggregation: the search for new content by all beneficiaries.
In the DoW we stated that we would find and ingest 75% of all still available European Daguerreotypes (ca 33,000). In order to reach the target of 25,000 daguerreotypes, we brought together 19,000 from collections linked directly to the consortium partners and already identified by the consortium partners. During the runtime of the project we still had to find 6,000 items. The misconception from the very start was that we assumed that this material all had been digitised.

We managed to pinpoint an extensive number of daguerreotypes. In order to reach our ambitious target we need to:
1. Trace daguerreotypes
2. Find digitized images
3. Find descriptive information in databases

Daguerreotypes are scarce and scattered; the largest known public collection is in the National Media Museum in the UK and contains …records. The smallest collections contain only 1 record, and that does not apply to just one collection, but 54.

Most collections contain fewer than 20 daguerreotypes, these are numerically, a negligible part of the complete archive or collection. Some of them were not even correctly listed in the archives as daguerreotypes. In many cases descriptive information is limited to non-existent. Also, given the polished silver surface, digitising takes a professional approach, which is time consuming. Convincing people to work with Daguerreobase was therefore a challenge. We had to convince institutes and collectors to digitize and describe.
The gap in information and digitized material, even in big institutions, exposes how vulnerable the project is. It also underlines the importance of Daguerreobase, a database for centralising information on daguerreotypes. The inventory can be extensive, but when there are neither digital images nor descriptions, and finances are not to be used for digitizing, the result remains below expectations.

To gain from a set of data, and to convince people of the added value of the database, you must reach a certain critical mass and richness. That was our biggest challenge in period three. We managed to aggregate more than 15,000 unique records, imported with high quality images from the front as well as the reverse and - if relevant - the sides and other details of the daguerreotypes and housings. In total this added up to over 34,000 images.

These 15,000 daguerreotypes are more or less half of all existing European Daguerreotypes. They come from 313 content providers and collections. From those collections 33% is private, these collections would have never been opened to a broad public if Daguerreobase had not been there.

**Uniqueness of the daguerreotypes**

The plates added in Daguerreobase include the earliest known photograph from Ireland:

A street scene: one side of the street is illuminated in sunlight, with shadows on the road. In the image we also see a gas street-lamp, four-storey houses, windows, doorways etc. Taken by John Nott in about 1840 in Cork, Ireland. An inscription on the reverse of the frame reads: 'The first Daguerreotype taken by John Nott'.

Carlo Federico Jest, Church of the Gran Madre di Dio in Turin, 1839. Fondazione Torino Musei-Galleria civica d’Arte Moderna (GAM). The image is the very first known Italian outdoor daguerreotype example by an Italian daguerreotypist and is dated on the verso of the mount: October 8th, 1839. It presents the Neoclassic-style church of Gran Madre di Dio, located in front of Piazza Vittorio Veneto, at the western side of the bridge Vittorio Emanuele I. The church was inaugurated in 1831. Signed on the paper mat: "Jest à Turin" On the verso: "Dessin photographique d'après le procédé de M. Daguerre per Henri F. Jest opt., Mec. De l'Université R. Des Etudes à Turin rue Po N. 46"
A group of the first photographs ever taken in the UK (by a Frenchman, Monsieur de Sainte Croix) in September or October 1839:

The earliest surviving views of many places in Italy as shown in the Ellis daguerreotypes (many links on Daguerreobase). We also added Ellis’ notes as literature.

We published a group of unknown experimental daguerreotype plates that had been sensitised for the full spectrum - decades before Vogel's discovery of the first colour sensitizer in 1873.
We identified the first known photographs to have survived by photographer W F Thomas:

Identification
1920-610_1

Image description
A grand house with glass houses in the foreground alongside another small building.

Tags
House, glasshouse, trees, windows, doors, roofs, landscape, pediment, chimneys, balustrade, buildings

While the approved biography for William F. Thomas, at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York states:

*Thomas had mastered the daguerreotype process in 1845 and gone on to be a sewing machine manufacturer in London. When he died, the British Journal of Photography called him the “oldest amateur photographer in the United Kingdom.” None of his photographs are known to have survived.*

We have identified many persons on portraits and have been able to highlight important historical people. If you look on Wikipedia there is often no photograph of these people and they are therefore difficult to identify.

*Caroline Chisholm*
Three quarter length portrait of a plump woman with a large lace (crocheted?) collar and silk shawl. The press cutting on the back refers to Mrs. Chisholm. Comparison with later printed portraits confirms she is the subject of the photograph. Caroline Chisholm was a humanitarian mostly known for her involvement with female immigrant welfare in Australia. She is regarded as a saint by the Church of England.
Composer Otto Nicoloai
Thanks to Daguerreobase, an unspectacular portrait of a man with a moustache in the Albertina collection (FotoGLV2000/9872) could be identified as composer Otto Nicoloai, best known for the opera “The Merry Wives of Windsor”, but better known as founder of the Viennese Philharmonic Orchestra. The collection of the Wien Museum houses an identified daguerreotype portrait of Mr. Nicolai from exactly the same photo shooting session (HMW 34146).

Portrait Marie Anna Leth von Lethenau
A private person browsed Daguerreobase and found an image of his ancestor Anna Leth von Lethenau by Lajos Kawalky in the Albertina collection (Foto2005/180). He pointed out that the young lady of no more than 25 years of age and so the person depicted in his daguerreotype most likely was not Ms Leth since Anna Leth should have been close to 60 years old at the time the daguerreotype was made. The name was therefore removed.
Records in numbers

The consortium partners made an inventory on the content before the Daguerreobase project started. Some beneficiaries made a miscalculation from the very start. The two German partners have probably mentioned too high numbers because both parties have counted the same collections. This calculation has been adjusted during our meeting in Cologne, but still turned out to be too high in the end. Others were able to find many more records as pre-conceived; special mentioning SMP +102%, NB +78% and MCS +53%

Beneficiary | DoW | adjusted | delivered |
--- | --- | --- | --- |
FoMu: | 265 | 317 | +19% |
NFM: | 3950 | 4177 | + 5% |
ARCP: | 190 | 180 | - 6% |
MLK: | 4500 | 3463 | - 24% |
CNA: | 20 | 19 | - 5% |
NTM: | 500 | 423 | - 16% |
TSD: | 4500 | 1085 | - 76% |
IPR: | 1000 | 1208 | +20% |
FMP: | 300 | 363 | +21% |
NB: | 300 | 534 | +78% |
UiB: | 211 | 237 | +12% |
SMP: | 350 | 710 | +102% |
MOCED: | 15 | 0 | -100% |
MCS: | 1000 | 1530 | + 53% |
KBDK: | 720 | 810 | + 12% |
UPV: | 750 | 867 | + 15% |
eDAVID: | 0 | 0 |
PIM: | 0 | 0 |
Total found | 6000 | 24571 | 15923 |

Though we did not reach the numbers of records that we expected, we feel that the Daguerreobase project can be called a success.

We still believe that the existing number of European Daguerreotypes is around 33,000 if we also count the ones that moved out of Europe, mainly to the USA. We were able to ingest almost 16,000, which is 50% of all existing material. And there is much more in the pipeline that will be ingested at short notice.

For example:
- more plates from the Victoria and Albert Museum that are currently on display at the museum and were not yet digitized.
- Plates from the National Portrait Gallery, their photographers have not finished taking photo’s yet.
- Musée d’Orsay 470 and
- Bibliothèque de Geneve another 350
- Musée Quai de Branly 570
- Harvard, George Eastman House and Smithsonian have indicated that they are very interested to weblinking after they have published their European daguerreotypes in the USA.

Often a Daguerreotype is seen as an extraordinary but simple photographic image. The main description was given to the image itself. The so-called housing was often forgotten or seen as an obstacle that obstructs the visibility and access to the photographic image. If we had described daguerreotypes this way, it would not have done justice to the wealth of information that a daguerreotype with its housing has. The added value of the database is that, for this reason, every object has several images; this richness will appeal to the users.

We managed to aggregate almost 16,000 unique records, imported with high quality images from the front as
well as the reverse and - if relevant - the sides and other details of the daguerreotypes and housings. In total this added up to over 35,000 images.

Content that will be ingested in the future

Sweden:
During the Awareness raising meeting in Helsinki, the representative from Sweden stated that in Sweden there must be around 500 daguerreotypes. NFM is now in close contact with several Swedish institutes and private collectors.

Switzerland:
In Switzerland 17 institutes and private collectors were traced by Museum Winterthur, a close relation of the NFM. The NFM has been contacting these institutes and collectors to bring in the daguerreotypes of them as well.

Russia:
In the list content to be found, a number of 30 daguerreotypes were listed for Russia. At the Awareness Raising Meeting in Helsinki we found out that there must be more than 800 daguerreotypes in Russia. Rosphoto just did an extensive research and is willing to bring these daguerreotypes after digitisation into Daguerreobase. NFM is in close contact to realise this assignment.

USA:
Many big collections containing daguerreotypes from Europe went to the USA, Smithsonian has 3500 European Daguerreotypes, George Eastman House has 5000, Harvard has 3500. NFM has contacted these institutes to convince them to bring the European material back to Europe by joining Daguerreobase.

Literature
Besides daguerreotypes, the DoW also described the ingestion of 8,000 pages of literature. The literature is a unique source for research; it contains 9,710 pages with primary and secondary literature from the Daguerreian era and shortly after (<1839 – ca. 1875). Subjects are mainly daguerreotype photography related, but also include technical and historical topics (chemistry, physics, optics, daguerreotypists, improvements, presentation forms and formats, other developments, trade labels etc.). Information about new discoveries or other contemporary photographic techniques are also incorporated, to give context to the development of early photography and to the later switch to reproducible techniques that resulted in the end of the daguerreotype era.
Work package 6: Project performance and evaluation

General objectives of Work Package 6

The activities described in WP6 have to result in the development of an adequate performance monitoring and measurement system that will inform the Project Management Board and the project coordinator about the project’s achievements, in terms of success and performance indicators. The results of the measurement system will help the PMB in the decision-making and will ensure the successful completion of the project.

The WP6 leader is NTM.

WP6-objectives for period 3 according to the DoW

Deliverables
D6.2.3 Project performance and progress report 3
D6.2.4 Project performance and progress report 4
D6.2.5 Project performance and progress report 5

Work progress and achievements WP 6

All three deliverables were submitted in period 3.

The remote Technical Review report states with regard to WP6:
There is some improvement in reporting, but not much in the conclusions based on these reports.

The coordinator tried to improve these reports together with NTM, but despite the goodwill and work of NTM the conclusions in these reports remain too superficial and did not affect the project.
The language barrier, the differences in culture and the physical distance did not help this partner in his tasks.
This partner should have been screened more thoroughly at the beginning of the project Daguerreobase. The partner, NTM, could have shown more self-insight and make the consortium understand that this task was too complicated, given the bureaucratic situation they still have to deal with.
Work package 7: Long term sustainability and IPR issues

General objectives of WP7 according to the DoW

WP7 includes the tasks to ensure the long-term sustainability of the project after the completion of the project. All rights of the content brought in by the content providers have to be cleared for online use, during and after the project runtime, the WP7 will generate the Daguerreobase user requirements including IPR issues.

The WP7 leader is eDAVID.

WP7-objectives for period 3 according to the DoW

Deliverables:
D7.2. EDA
D7.4. Daguerreobase Business Model and Plan

Work progress and achievements WP7 (Period 3)

The WP7 leader is e-DAVID. After the second review, Daguerreobase was offered a suspension time of 6 months. At that time it became clear that eDAVID had to work on other assignments that form the core of their business and can therefore not be ignored. The coordinator of Daguerreobase has searched for a solution to solve this problem and came to an agreement with e-DAVID: The work that still needed to be done was divided over the other beneficiaries, e-DAVID would return 10 p/m in order to pay the beneficiaries that took over their work; NFM for testing, FoMu for the business plan.

Testing

In period 2 it became clear that, due to the fact that the extended Daguerreobase format was declined, testing could only be done later in the process. Since April 2014 the simple form works well and testing started. Tests were run in cooperation with NFM and the outcomes of the tests are the basis of all improvements in the database. Test results are described in Deliverable D4.3 Reports of acceptance testing of Daguerreobase and D4.5 Web services and functionality report.

Long-term sustainability and the European Daguerreotype Association (EDA)

One of the key aspects for sustainability was the foundation of The European Daguerreotype Association (EDA). The EDA has been founded according the Belgian law on non-profit organisations on 13 December 2014.

When we started working on EDA, our goal was: an international association that is there for as well professional as non-professional photography enthusiasts, with special interest in history and art of the daguerreotype, organised as a membership-based association. EDA would offer access to a worldwide and growing network of curators, conservators, museums, teachers, specialists, collectors and private owners. Members would share their knowledge in the different aspects of the use and practise of early photographic techniques and their expressions and become a strong and interactive community. Partners of EDA would offer assistance in organising workshops, publications, collection maintenance, education and teaching. And last but not least EDA itself would produce the magazine, organise conferences, meetings and a special symposium, cultural travels or excursions for her members each year, on different locations all over Europe.

Though EDA has about 140 potential members, we are not convinced anymore that EDA should become a membership-based association. Members will always want to see something in return for their membership contribution. Looking at the relationship between income and expenditure, it is questionable whether a membership organization produces financial benefit for EDA.
Beside that, looking at the work that still needs to be done: awareness on the importance of digitization, preservation, copyrights, etcetera, and the fact that we often have dealt with small institutions that are not able to sort out all information on these issues themselves, it is more in line to become a knowledge centre and keep building on the daguerrobase community.

People that are on the EDA board right now are:
- Ann Deckers, Head of collections FoMu, Antwerp, president
- Hans Gummersbach, Private collector, vice president
- Wouter Lambrechts, teacher and photographer on old techniques, secretary
- Herman Maes, Conservator NFM, treasurer (resigned and was replaced by Tamara Berghmans)
- Agnes Wijers, cultural entrepreneur, member

After the runtime of the financed part of Daguerreobase, there was a vote scheduled, whereby members could elect their new board. At this time we believe it is better to link Daguerreobase to the two institutions that have started the project together; NFM and FOMU. Ruud Visschedijk, director at NFM and Elviera Velghe, director at FOMU promised to take on this role by both taking a role in the board of the association and both providing 0,05Fte each to make sure that the work will be continued. In addition, we would like to provide a role in governance to the two most active members of the consortium: Nicholas Burnett MCS and Sandra Petrillo SMP, for their skills on the content and marketing and communication. A fifth board member that we are still looking for should be a specialist in law and copyright.

EDA will off course stay linked closely to all consortium partners and will follow and communicate their activities.

EDA will work on Daguerreobase’s sustainability by becoming the encyclopaedia on daguerreotypes; answering questions and sharing information on digitization, description of daguerreotypes or collections, copyrights, preservation and conservation through the website, facebook and an annual symposium. The 9710 pages of related literature will be very helpful for research. Besides that we will keep on promoting the database as a source of inspiration for creating exhibitions around daguerreotypes or related exhibitions that contain daguerreotypes as part of a bigger whole.

EDA also organises conservation and restoration projects at universities and art schools. NFM will take the lead, while other consortium partners will organise workshops and trainings in their own countries to make it easier and economic for participants. All workshops that take place will be used to share information to everyone, to start debates and to come to new conclusions and insights.
Long term sustainability and business plan

The only way to keep the database up and running is to bring the database to life. So how can we bring our visitors from a passive attitude to an active and even interactive attitude? This was the key thought by developing the business plan. We see two multipliers that we want to explore: Storytelling and Genealogy

Storytelling
EDA feels that storytelling is another way to get the database alive! It is not easy to reach a public if information is available in a database and not yet clustered into small pieces. The success of the journal made us realise how important it is to provide information as bite-sized chunks so visitors are drawn into the story and delve for more information. Keeping up the journal is impossible in these times, being a project on digitisation, the journal is transformed into a blog. It is too time-consuming to have a quarterly journal. A monthly blog is moreover a simple tool to be in touch with you audience on a regular basis. The blog can both be on technical aspects as on content aspects.

All consortium partners were asked to deliver in 2016, five or six interesting stories on material that they have delivered, preferably on the most important content, but even more important is the story itself. Through the website and Facebook, these stories will be presented to a broad audience, inviting them at the same time to visit the website and database to find more related information.

Some examples of daguerreotypes that are easily brought to life, related to techniques of that time, royals or the migration of daguerreotypes

The Austrian Staatsdruckerei

In early 1850s the Austrian Staatsdruckerei (State Printing Department) wanted to find a workable method to print from daguerreotypes. The director Alois Auer hired the Danish photographer Christian Piil for this project. They failed in finding a practicable method. Until now no surviving daguerreotype of this research period was known to exist. However, by means of the Daguerreobase network it was possible to locate 2 daguerreotypes in Scandinavian collections that were clearly made from the rooftop of the Staatsdruckerei (a comparable saltpaper-print with the same view of St. Stephens cathedral exists). They can be directly related to Piil and his time at the Austrian Staatsdruckerei (Fau111 and SE_INS_TEMU_KA18).

Prince Albert, Prince of Wales

Hand-coloured daguerreotype with gold highlights on tie-pin (with Prince-of-Wales feathers) and waistcoat of Prince Albert, seated and facing partly right. He has dark sideburns and a small moustache, his dark hair parted on the right. His left arm rests on the arm of the chair and his right rests on his lap. He is wearing a beige jacket and a dark brown waistcoat. The background is painted blue with white clouds and the daguerreotype is mounted under glass. On the reverse there is a label reading 'The Prince from Life 1848', handwritten by Queen Victoria. Prince Albert was an early enthusiast of photography and closely followed the development of the medium. In February 1847 Kilburn showed examples of his coloured daguerreotypes, made by adding fine coloured powders to the photographic plate, to the Society of Arts. In 1848 Prince Albert commissioned a portrait using the new technique. This is one of two surviving hand-coloured daguerreotypes produced from the sitting.
American Indian Man

“Half quarter length frontal portrait of a seated American Indian man wearing two large Indian peace medals on his chest, one above the other”, c.1859. Private collection.

This is a daguerreotype, which belongs to an Italian family. The great grandfather of the owner, who had travelled to America in 1859, brought it back. This image opens an amazing portal into the history of Native Americans and their struggles to preserve their land.

A handwritten inscription on a label attached to the metal mat protecting the plate says "Frenchman". This no doubt refers to the mixed blood of the portrayed young man and his father was probably an early trader in the northwest & eastern plains, almost all of who were French. His mother might have belonged to the Omaha or Winnebago tribe. The fact that there are two medallions suggests that he and a close relative travelled to Washington two separate times. “It is worth noting that one of the Winnebago leaders who signed the treaty of 15 April 1859 in Washington was defined as a young Frenchman.” Says a specialist in American Indian history and arts who we have consulted. This image is very important for the American history -we hope to receive soon more historical information on the precise identity of the sitter – and to retrace stories of 19th century European travellers to America.

Portrait of the Armenian antique dealer and collector, Serop Alishan

This daguerreotype tells a story of immigration of European to America and is also a very important image for the Armenian history. This is the “Portrait of the Armenian antique dealer and collector, Serop Alishan”, the twin brother of Father Ghevond Alishan (1820-1901), a famous poet and priest for the Mechitarist Congregation of the Armenian Catholic Church based on the small island of “San Lazzaro degli Armeni” in the Venetian lagoon (Armenian Catholic Monastery). Serop, sitting next to a table covered by a decorated cloth, holds a metal lion's head (a symbol of strength and courage) and in his other hand a Greek "tears-holder", a object that the ancient Greeks used to collect the tears of a grieving person. A large wooden box for a Chinese “Go” set inlaid with mother stands on the table and on top of this there is a Persian style fez hat and collection of coins. In front of the box there seem to be some Egyptian ushabti funerary figurines and a finely moulded terracotta head, probably a fragment of a Greek Tanagra figure. According to Malcom, M. Vartan The Armenians in America. 1919. Reprint. London:Forgotten Books, 2013, pp. 58-59 “In 1845 Serop Alishan, brother of Father Alishan, the distinguished Armenian/ poet, reached America.”

Genealogy

Another way the database will be brought under the attention of a broad public is through genealogy. Why do people search for their ancestors: Genealogy is about history on a personal scale. It helps satisfy a deep need to understand how we fit into the broader world around us. Genealogy is more than just a collection of single-family threads passing through time. It truly is a journey of many lifetimes woven together from the past, the present and (from our perspective) the future. Not only documents on ancestors can be found, but we can actually also offer to find their images, this will especially interesting if we can combine this search with the material of Europeana Photography. We therefore built a case study together with Europeana to research this possibility, moreover to find subsidy and sponsors for a more extensive project on genealogy. The genealogy project has a strong link to the UK lottery fund that has shown interest in Daguerreobase and Early Photography as providers of interesting visual material that can be incorporated in the search after family histories.
**Portrait Marie Anna Leth von Lethenau**

A private person browsed Daguerreobase and found an image of his ancestor Anna Leth von Lethenau by Lajos Kawalky in the Albertina collection (Foto2005/180). He helped to point out that the young lady of max. 25 years of age depicted in his daguerreotype most likely was not the person, since Anna Leth should have been close to 60 years at the time the daguerreotype was made. So the name was removed.

**Portrait of Otto Nicolai**

Because of daguerreobase, an unspectacular portrait of a man with a moustache in the Albertina collection (FotoGLV2000/9872) could be identified as composer Otto Nicolai, best known for the opera “The Merry Wifes of Windsor”, but better known as founder of the Viennese Philharmonic Orchestra. The collection of the Wien Museum houses an identified daguerreotype portrait of Mr. Nicolai from exactly the same photo shooting session (HMW 34146).

**Förster family**

An anonymous, unidentified group portrait (FotoGLV2000/9964) in the Albertina collection could be identified as the children of the Viennese architect Ludwig Ritter von Förster (HMW71705). An image of this daguerreotype was found during literature research for the Daguerreobase project in an earlier publication (IPR 1962-04), that had additional information on the depicted persons. This information, written on an insert, got lost.

Ludwig Ritter von Förster was the leading architect when it came to reshape the city of Vienna in early 1860s by replacing the citywalls with a splendid boulevard lined with parlours (Ringstraße). Historians have long time known from source literature that Förster and his family have actively made daguerreotypes, yet there was no daguerreotype evidence until now. This finding became the kick-off for reexamining the collection for more images from Förster and his family circle.

The genealogy project has a strong link to the UK lottery fund that has shown interest in Daguerreobase and Early Photography as providers of interesting visual material that can be incorporated in the search after family histories.
**Research**

Besides the two multipliers storytelling and genealogy, EDA wants to stay focused on research. Daguerreobase is now starting to be used by researchers in the way we hoped. We recently received an early draft of a paper examining the different housings for Beard patentee daguerreotypes. Richard Beard, UK’s ‘Mr Daguerreotype’ in the 1840s, owned the UK daguerreotype patent and sold licenses for professional use of the process. For the 1840s at least, licensees were obliged to label their daguerreotypes BEARD PATENTEE. Beard also sold them the housings, manufactured at his own factory. This paper creates a style chronology and hierarchy of costs for housings from basic to luxury. Being able to fit undated Beard patentee plates into a chronology is a great advance. Several of the images in the draft are taken straight from Daguerreobase. We have not carried out a survey of who is using Daguerreobase in their research so this paper, which we learnt of in a random way, is probably just one of many.

Last year a student of the Second Cycle Degree Programme in Chemical Science for Conservation and Restoration at the University of Ca’Foscari, Venice used Daguerreobase in her research. The database provided the student with very interesting visual examples of physical, chemical and biological alterations found on European and American daguerreotype plates and mountings. These examples were included in the thesis: “Non invasive diagnostic techniques applied on 19th century American daguerreotypes and experimental methods of atmospheric plasma cleaning”, a research dissertation written under the supervision of Prof. Paolo Ugo and co-supervised by Sandra M. Petrillo, which will be presented in March 2016.

The Photographic History Research Centre at De Montfort University includes Daguerreobase in their presentation to new students about important resources for photographic history. [http://www.dmu.ac.uk/research/research-faculties-and-institutes/art-design-humanities/phrc/photographic-history-research-centre-phrc.aspx](http://www.dmu.ac.uk/research/research-faculties-and-institutes/art-design-humanities/phrc/photographic-history-research-centre-phrc.aspx)

The National Media Museum refers, without exception, researchers on daguerreotypes to Daguerreobase.

For every curator or collector who writes there may be 100 who don’t. This e-mail is very much the ‘tip of the iceberg’. Daguerreobase will ingest these daguerreotypes announce and share Higgins publications.

We have not carried out a survey of who is using Daguerreobase in their research; these examples are probably just some of many.

**Communication**

EDA has taken in different vehicles to bring the work done under the attention of a broad public: The success formula of the daguerreotype of the month will be continued on the website. The journal will be turned into a blog and will appear monthly. The new blogs will be announced on Facebook. Facebook will be the instrument to make announcements, for more deepened information the website will be the instrument.

Pinterest already contains many daguerreotypes. It is interesting to create a board or pin the latest findings, videos on daguerreotypes or other visual material. It easily attracts people to share information and make them delve into the collected information of Daguerreobase.

Instagram focuses on simplicity and inspiring creativity. The global community Instagram that shares more than 60 million photos every day is an excellent tool for visual storytelling for everyone with a creative passion.
Working together with Europeana

In the upcoming months (January – May 2016) Daguerreobase will work together with Europeana on
1. Improvement of the metadata and
2. Carry out two case studies on
   a. How to convince smaller institutes to open up their cultural heritage?
   b. How can you bring a database to life to a broad public?

Financed by Europeana

1. Improvement of data quality

   a. Improvement of metadata, in narrow cooperation with Europeana
   Analyse the full dataset in cooperation with Europeana. Europeana is waiting for their media discovery tool to complete the analysis of technical metadata of the Daguerreobase dataset.

   The Daguerreobase has an advanced set of technical metadata. During the last months of the project many records were imported and new terms were added without a proper consult of an editorial team. Also, in fields where could be edited freely, the metadata should be improved to meet the international standards. The main goal is not to go through all records again in the database but to improve the metadata by editing and merging related SKOS terms and by search and replace actions.

   b. Image size
   Many high-resolution images in Daguerreobase are displayed as thumbnails in Europeana, due to the fact that many content providers do not want to give away their material free for re-use. Sometimes, this material is under cc label and therefore protected against re-use. To have the chance using the material for thematic collections that Europeana is developing, pictures must be larger than 800 px. Daguerreobase brings back the images to high-resolution images in Europeana’s database, where further feedback to the content providers is not necessary; in other words, looks for cases where the reduction of the picture is wrongly applied.

   c. Review use of watermarks
   No use of watermarks when cc rights are applicable to increase the likelihood that this material will be used according to the license.

   d. Institutions names in EDM
   Currently, the data provider field is used for all institutions gathering daguerreotypes from other institutions, while their name is in dcterms: provenance. So instead of 15 institutions/collectors daguerreobase provides data from, it is actually more than 300 institutions/collectors.
   This has several disadvantages; first, there is no facet in the portal to only look at content from individual institutions. Second, it is difficult to attribute the institution as this information is quite hidden in the dataset. Third, if these institutions are from more than one country, we cannot move away from Europe as the providing country.
   This is also due to EDM providing enough fields to display this information, Europeana is working on this problem to make it easier for the full aggregation chain to be displayed. In the meanwhile a solution for the records delivered by Daguerreobase could be: Map all provenance information to edm: dataprovider, remove the country information and add to the corresponding edm field. What is now in edm: dataprovider would end up in a new edm field, which will not have a facet on the portal, but will still be searchable.

   e. Remove duplicates
   Supply an overview of the records provided by Daguerreobase that also came in Europeana via other sources/aggregators. In close cooperation with Europeana, find a solution how to link these records to both aggregators or to choose which aggregator will be mentioned in Europeana.
Examples:

Daguerreobase
(http://www.europeana.eu/portal/record/2058401/_providedCHO_401502e9_90b0_8ffe_ae41_fe319ba6aa46.html)
Also been ingested by BnF via TEL

Daguerreobase
http://www.europeana.eu/portal/record/2058401/_providedCHO_fbf55fd5_8505_e2e1_a218_4a7f3c88a563.html,
Also been ingested by the Rijksmuseum directly

2. Case studies

a. Case study on opening up cultural heritage.
   Daguerreobase dealt with many small collections and private collectors. It was often difficult to convince people to open up their material to a large public. They were afraid of giving away the heritage they were asked to take care of. Many institutes we met don’t have the time, staff or financial resources to put energy in these kinds of questions. How can Europeana and aggregators help them understand where the line between giving away and opening up lies? What are the do’s and don’ts? How can small(er) institutes profit from digitization?
   This case study should be on good examples, like Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe in Hamburg, but also on problems encountered during the runtime of the project, with recommendations for future content providers. Advising Europeana how to deal with smaller institutions, but also, giving back information to the smaller institutions Daguerreobase works with.

b. Case study on How can you bring a database to life for a broad public?
   What can we do to promote the collections that we have aggregated in Daguerreobase and uploaded in Europeana. The only way to bring a database to the public is to bring it to life, to actually use the database for research, exhibitions and events. To link to other data, for example, Daguerreobase contains many portraits, the clothing you see on these portraits learn us a lot about the era. If you can combine photography with fashion, the data could be used in so many more ways then before.
   Another example: Why do people search for their ancestors? Genealogy is about history on a personal scale. It helps satisfy a deep need to understand how we fit into the broader world around us. Genealogy is more than just a collection of single-family threads passing through time. It truly is a journey of many lifetimes woven together from the past, the present and (from our perspective) the future. This case study is not necessarily limited to Daguerreobase. This study should also apply for early photography and in that sense provide cross-links in Europeana’s database.

Network
The main result of this project is the network that has been created. More than 300 institutions and individuals have contributed to Daguerreobase. The fact that these daguerreotypes come from so many sources has been one of the biggest difficulties and at the same time one of the greatest assets of the project. The consortium partners did not just have to convince one or two large institutions to do their part, but they had to convince dozens of organizations and individuals, and with all of them, big or small, they had to make contracts, transfer the material into an ingestible format and had to import the files into the database. That was an immense amount of work.
But, this network turned out to be and will continue to be our best tool to convince others to put their daguerreotype in our database, by collecting and describing we understand what is still there; this is essential for the conservation of these vulnerable objects. The interest shown by an outside body often helps to draw attention to these sometimes-neglected treasures. The network snowball was not rolling immediately, but now it rolls it is unstoppable.

He found Daguerreobase through http://britishphotohistory.ning.com/ and a link from the photography museum in Helsinki whilst looking at another photography related item. Most of their daguerreotypes are from New Zealand (where they are quite rare) but there are also examples of daguerreotypes that were brought with immigrants, or collected (such as the one he mentions). The collector (MacKelvie) bought this plate in 1854 and attributed to Daguerre, 1939, however the plate has Bisson on it.

He wrote us, after we asked him to share this information to the database:
Yes I’d love to share it through the database. I thought it would be of interest to European scholars/collectors to know of such an example that made its way across the world. I can arrange for images showing both sides.
It is interesting to note the 1885 catalogue from the collector who owned this daguerreotype attributed it to Daguerre.
I’ll do some more research on this as I want to try and find out what happened to the second one mentioned in his catalogue:

Catalogue of the MacKelvie Collection, for Auckland, New Zealand. 1885.
836 Original Daguerreotype of “The Mint, Paris,” by Daguerre, 1839. From the “Stokes” collection, sold in 1854. The French Government granted Daguerre an annuity of 6,000 francs for this discovery. A silvered plate was exposed to the fumes of iodine and thus rendered sensitive to light. The latent image was then brought out by exposure to the fumes of mercury.

The daguerreotype has L.A. Bisson’s label advertisement on the verso (adhered to the backing paper), which is why it is now attributed to Bisson rather than Daguerre. In terms of other daguerreotypes most of the daguerreotypes in New Zealand are late by comparison dating to the 1850s.
I’ve been researching daguerreotypes in the collection (with a particular interest in establishing locally made examples). I’ve written a couple of papers on the topic, which are pending publication shortly.

For every curator or collector who writes there may be 100 who don’t. This e-mail is very much the ‘tip of the iceberg’. Daguerreobase will ingest these daguerreotypes announce and share Higgins publications.

The consortium partners realised that the outcome of the project and the project itself have brought them various benefits:
Museum Ludwig in Cologne rediscovered parts of their collection and also found non-registered daguerreotypes. ‘Daguerreobase is a door opener for the visibility of collections and research’.
The National Bibliotek in Norway found their national as their international network greatly enhanced.
Through Daguerreobase they gained further insight into collections and found out who the actual experts are. Furthermore the project has been educational for the institutions themselves, they learned how to handle, describe and bring daguerreotypes to the attention of the public.
Nicolas Burnett (MCS) has enlarged his network; he was asked to provide conservation training and received some commissions as a result of this project. He identified, and still is identifying, daguerreotype collections (Great Britain in the age of the daguerreotype had the highest per capita income of any country in the world (Bairoch, Paul (1976): “Europe's Gross National Product: 1800–1975”, Journal of European Economic History, Vol. 5, pp. 273–340). The country has not been fought over since that time though it was bombed. In consequence there are still lots of daguerreotypes to be found.) He sees a lot of potential research projects, some of them already started, others in an advanced state.
The NTM in Prague has studied the collection of NTM more intensively. They have a better understanding of the importance of their collection on a national and international level.
The Finnish Museum of Photography enlarged their contacts and network with neighbouring countries (Baltic countries, Russia, Sweden), with European colleagues and members of Daguerreobase project. The project resulted in increased interest in, and respect for daguerreotypes in other museums and archives, when they had to catalogue, check the condition and photograph their daguerreotypes. One of the findings was a better view of daguerreotypes existing in Finland; and a depressing knowledge about their poor condition on average. They will use the knowledge and the images for writing an application for grants to fund a national conservation project for saving Finnish daguerreotypes.

IPR in Austria sees the deepening of existing network connections (museums, curators, collectors) as one of the most valuable outcomes of the project besides new contacts Europe-wide to the members of the Daguerreobase consortium.

SMP in Italy was able to publish in the database daguerreotypes owned by private collectors which were never published in books before. Daguerreotypes made by Italian daguerreotypist are very rare, thanks to Daguerreobase it is now possible to see and read about several interesting examples.

The invitation of Martin Juergens of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, to contribute to the ICOM meeting with Daguerreobase as subject, speaks for itself:

Is there anyone who could give a talk about Daguerreobase at the upcoming ICOM-CC Photographic Materials Working Group Interim Meeting (Rijksmuseum, 21-24 Sept. 2016)? I think this would be great idea, since I can imagine that a number of non-European participants may not know Daguerreobase well, and since your work on this project has been so very successful! Please give it some thought, but not too long, since the deadline for the Call for Papers is January 15!

This essentially shows how useful this website has become, also to non-Europeans!

And of course we have accepted this invitation. The title of the presentation is *Daguerreotypes: Sharing Unique Objects on www.Daguerreobase.org*
3. Deliverables and milestones tables

Please list all the deliverables due in this reporting period, as indicated in Annex I of the Grant Agreement. Deliverables that are of a nature other than written "reports", such as "prototypes", "demonstrators" or "others", should also be accompanied by a short report, so that the European Commission has a record of their existence.

If a deliverable has been cancelled or regrouped with another one, please indicate this in the column "Comments".

If a new deliverable is proposed, please indicate this in the column "Comments".

This table is "cumulative", that is, it should always show all deliverables from the beginning of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Del. no.</th>
<th>Deliverable name</th>
<th>WP no.</th>
<th>Lead participant</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due delivery date from Annex I</th>
<th>Delivered Yes/No</th>
<th>Actual / Forecast delivery date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td>Project Quality Plan</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28/02/2013 Re-submitted on 31/03/2014</td>
<td>Rejected - Resubmitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>First Periodic Report including Financial Statement</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30/10/2013 Re-submitted on</td>
<td>Rejected - Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Second Periodic Report including Financial Statement</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30/09/2014 APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4</td>
<td>Final Project Report</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31/01/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5</td>
<td>Final Financial Report</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31/01/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del. no.</td>
<td>Deliverable name</td>
<td>WP no.</td>
<td>Lead participant</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due delivery date from Annex I</td>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td>Actual / Forecast delivery date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>Action Plan for enrolling new partners</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28/02/2013</td>
<td>Re-submitted on 15/12/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Informative booklet (several languages)</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28/02/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Dissemination plan</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30/04/2013</td>
<td>Re-submitted on 31/03/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4</td>
<td>Daguerreotype 4- Monthly Journal</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19/11/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>Europeana Virtual Daguerreotype Exhibition</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Launched on 26/02/2015</td>
<td>Exhibition got reduced by Europeana from 81 images to 26 images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del. no.</td>
<td>Deliverable name</td>
<td>WP no.</td>
<td>Lead participant</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due delivery date from Annex I</td>
<td>Delivered Yes/No</td>
<td>Actual / Forecast delivery date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1</td>
<td>Best Practice Program</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28/02/2013</td>
<td>Rejected – Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-submitted on 15/12/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2.1</td>
<td>A technical standard for the general description of daguerreotypes content</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23/09/2013</td>
<td>Conditionnally Approved - Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-submitted on 31/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2.2</td>
<td>A community standard for the general description of daguerreotypes content</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23/09/2013</td>
<td>Conditionnally Approved - Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-submitted on 31/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2.3</td>
<td>A community standard for the general description of daguerreotype objects</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23/09/2013</td>
<td>Conditionnally Approved - Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-submitted on 31/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2.4</td>
<td>A multilingual set of thesauri or entries list for the description of daguerreotype objects</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23/09/2013</td>
<td>Conditionnally Approved - Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-submitted on 31/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del. no.</td>
<td>Deliverable name</td>
<td>WP no.</td>
<td>Lead participant</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due delivery date from Annex I</td>
<td>Delivered Yes/No</td>
<td>Actual / Forecast delivery date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Road Map WP4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>08/03/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Reports of Acceptance Testing WP4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19/11/2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.4</td>
<td>Multilingual Online User manual and guidelines WP4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19/11/2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.5</td>
<td>Web services and functionality Report WP4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19/11/2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>Ingestion Plan for content providing WP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>08/03/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rejected twice – Resubmitted</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-submitted on 31/03/2014 and 15/12/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>Collection Management setup WP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30/04/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>API WP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31/07/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rejected – Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.4</td>
<td>Linked Open Data integration WP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>XXX Resubmitted on XXX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rejected – Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.5</td>
<td>Linking Europeana Collection WP5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Submitted with delay</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Del. no.</th>
<th>Deliverable name</th>
<th>WP no.</th>
<th>Lead participant</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due delivery date from Annex I</th>
<th>Delivered Yes/No</th>
<th>Actual / Forecast delivery date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>Performance monitoring and measurement system</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28/02/2013</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28/02/2013</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2.1</td>
<td>Project Performance and progress report 1</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23/09/2013</td>
<td>Rejected twice – resubmitted</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2.2</td>
<td>Project Performance and progress report 2</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Re-submitted on 15_12_2014</td>
<td>Rejected-Resubmitted</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2.3</td>
<td>Project Performance and progress report 3</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15-12-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2.4</td>
<td>Project Performance and progress report 4</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-11-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2.5</td>
<td>Project Performance and progress report 5</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19-11-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del. no.</td>
<td>Deliverable name</td>
<td>WP no.</td>
<td>Lead participant</td>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due delivery date from Annex I</td>
<td>Delivered Yes/No</td>
<td>Actual / Forecast delivery date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>Long Term Sustainability Plan</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Re-submitted on 19/11/2015</td>
<td>Rejected – Resubmitted APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>Registration of the European Daguerreotype Association</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30/04/2013 and 19/11/2015</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>General user requirements document, including IPR guidelines</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30/04/2013</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.4</td>
<td>Daguerreobase Business Model and Plan</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19/11/2015</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Milestones

*Please complete this table if milestones are specified in Annex I of the Grant Agreement. Milestones will be assessed against the specific criteria and performance indicators as defined in Annex I.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone no.</th>
<th>Milestone name</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Due achievement date from Annex I</th>
<th>Achieved Yes/No</th>
<th>Actual / Forecast achievement date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>Kick off meeting and PMB1, FOMU</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20-21-22/11/2013</td>
<td>3-day meeting instead of 2 day meeting at FoMu in Antwerp (coordinator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>PMB 2, host ARCP</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>04/02/2013</td>
<td>This PMB 2 was combined with MS13 (Best practice workshop 1) and therefore host was MLK instead of ARCP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>PMB 3, host TSD</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25/04/2013</td>
<td>TSD resigned as WP3-leader and, as a consequence is no longer member of the Project Management Board. Host was FoMu instead of TSD. This Board meeting was combined with the kick-off meeting with newly appointed PO Mr Marcel Watelet on April 26, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>PMB 4, host PIM</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13/06/2013</td>
<td>A “post kick-off” meeting was held at NFM (Rotterdam) in order to discuss the issues that have risen during the kick off meeting on April 26, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>PMB 5, host eDAVID</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28/08/2013</td>
<td>Host Picturae Belgium instead of eDAVID. Organised earlier than planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>PMB, host 6, NTM</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21/1/2014</td>
<td>Organised earlier than planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Daguerreotype and Conservation workshop</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>October 8-9, 2015, Bry-sur-Marne</td>
<td>Replaced by the Daguerreotype Symposium 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Awareness Raising Meeting 1, NTM</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>January 22 and 23, 2014</td>
<td>Two-day-meeting: Images of the Past, Reflections of the Present. NTM, Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS10</td>
<td>Awareness Raising Meeting 2, SMP</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22/10/2013</td>
<td>Quando la fotografia era una lastra d’argento, Istituto nazionale per la grafica, Palazzo Poli, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS11</td>
<td>Awareness Raising Meeting 3, FMP</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>09/06/2014</td>
<td>Daguerre Day, FMP, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS12</td>
<td>Awareness Raising Meeting 4, Romania</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15/11/2013</td>
<td>Replaced by Awareness Raising Meeting at Paris Photo (organised by ARCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS13</td>
<td>Best Practice workshop 1, host MLK</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5-6/02/2013</td>
<td>Two day meeting at Cologne with entire consortium to discuss actions, roadmap, communication, planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS14</td>
<td>Best Practice workshop 2, host ARCP</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>09/10/2013</td>
<td>Testing of the new Daguerreobase portal at Paris, host Picturae instead of ARCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra/new</td>
<td>Kick Off meeting with new Project Officer Mr Marcel Watelet</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>Not planned</td>
<td></td>
<td>26/4/2013</td>
<td>Kick Off meeting at FoMu Project management Board with PO Mr Marcel Watelet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. Project management Daguerreobase

Please use this section to summarise management of the consortium activities during the period.

This section should include the following:

- Consortium management tasks and achievements;
- Problems which have occurred and how they were solved or envisaged solutions;
- Changes in the consortium, if any;
- List of project meetings, dates and venues;
- Project planning and status;
- Impact of possible deviations from the planned milestones and deliverables, if any;
- Impact of possible deviations from the planned resources;
- Any changes to the legal status of any of the beneficiaries, in particular non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs status;
- Development and use of the Project website;
- Use and dissemination activities during this period (if applicable).

Please add any other relevant issue, which had or is likely to have an impact on project management.

The section should also provide short comments and information on coordination activities during the period in question, such as communication between beneficiaries, possible cooperation with other projects/programmes etc.
4.1 Consortium management tasks and achievements

General objectives of WP1

WP1 includes the general management and the coordination of tasks to realise the project. The aim of this work package is to:

- Manage the project in an efficient way, and facilitate the coordination between the work package leaders and all consortium partners;
- Evaluate the project progress in respect to the defined project objectives, budget, resources and time;
- Maintain and manage administrative and financial aspects of the project in accordance with the requirements of the grant agreement between the Commission and the project consortium;
- Promote activities and exchange information between the members of the consortium;
- Coordinate the project activities with other projects at both national and international levels.

The project coordinator, FoMu, is the leader of WP1.

WP1-objectives for period 3 according to DoW

Deliverables

D1.4. Final Project Report

The Final Project report has to be submitted 60 days after the end date of the project (31 October 2015). Due to circumstances a delay of one month was accepted by the EC.

D1.5 Final Financial report

This final financial report has to be submitted 60 days after the of the last payments.

Milestones

Taking the lead in project Management Boards and organizing the technical reviews (December 2015).

According to the DoW the following milestones were planned:

MS6: PMB 6, host NTM delivery date month 25
MS7: Final Meeting and PMB 7, host NFM, delivery date month 30 (2 day meeting)

In period 3 MS 6 or PMB 6 was planned in month 25. But this meeting already took place in period 2 on October 7, 2013 in Paris.

MS7: Final Meeting, Technical review and PMB 7 took place on December 2nd and 3rd at NFM Rotterdam

MS8, Milestone 8, Daguerreotype Conservation Workshop (planned delivery date: month 6), had been postponed and sill needed to be organised in Period 3.

Administrative tasks include:

- the keeping of records, financial accounts and distribution of financial contributions;
- the production of periodic progress reports and the preparation of EC project reviews.
4.2. Work progress and achievements for Period 3

4.2.1 Financial and administrative obligations

4.2.1.1. Payment of interim payment to beneficiaries

On 29/09/2015 the EC transferred an amount of 629.955 euro as interim payments for period 1 and 2. The coordinator forwarded payments to all beneficiaries according to the assessment done by the EC respecting the time limit of 30 days.

4.2.1.3. Communication and coordination

The Project Management Board only did meet at Rotterdam on December 2nd, 2015, but the project coordinator was in close communication with the different WP-leaders. For reasons of cost saving the PMB at NTM did not take place in this period, however a PMB was already hosted by NTM in Prague in period 2.

Because of the distance it was not possible to have separate meetings with WP6-leader NTM from Czech Republic.

After the technical review of June 25, 2014 in Valencia, where a suspension period was announced, the consortium did not meet anymore until the final meeting in Rotterdam on December

Apart from personal contact, the day-to-day communication was mainly directed via:
- Basecamp, the digital communication platform, is an excellent platform for Best Practice discussions
- e-mail: for direct and personalized action
- phone: to explain and give additional information on matters that are quite hard to explain in written form.

Use of the project website


The Coordinator FoMu used the following tools to monitor the activities and the use of resources of the consortium.

1) time logs: these register the amount of hours worked and are automatically transferred into person-months.

2) narrative reports: these documents serve to register and communicate activities done.

3) use of resources (document provided by the EC)

In period 3 the narrative reports was adapted in more user friendly documents that refine the follow-up of tasks and use of resources, also taking into account the suspension period.
4.3. Evaluation of the project progress in respect to the defined project objectives, budget, resources and time

4.3.1. Deliverables of WP1

In the Dow the following deliverables are mentioned:

Deliverable: D1.4
This deliverable is to be submitted 60 days after the ending of period 3 (October 31st).

Deliverable: D1.5
The coordinator shall submit a report on the distribution of the financial contribution of the Union between beneficiaries. This report shall be submitted not later than 30 days after receipt of the final payment. Since the final payment was not received yet, this report has not been written yet.

4.3.2. Milestones of WP1: List of project meetings, dates and venues during period 3

In period 3 the following milestones were listed as planned in Period 3

- MS 6, PMB6, host NTM, delivery date month 25
- MS 7, Final meeting and PMB 7, host NFM

MS6 had already taken place in January 2014 in Prague

MS7 took place on December 2nd (PMB) and December 3rd, 2015 at the Stichting Nederlands Fotomuseum (NFM) in Rotterdam.

MS8, the Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop, was organised on October 8 and 9 in Bry-sur-Marne. It was called ‘The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015’.
4.3.3 Coordinate the project activities with other projects on national and international level

Given the recommendation of the technical review report dated 14 July 2014 (*R5: It is recommended to avoid spending resources on additional activities that detract from the core objectives of the project*) contacts with other national and international projects were low.

FOMU occasionally was in contact with the colleagues of MOMU who were a Work Package leader in the Europeana Fashion project and with the KU Leuven that was being both Project Coordinator and WP Leader for the Collections and Themes work package of the Europeana Photography project.

4.3.4 Problems which have occurred and how they were solved or envisaged solutions

4.3.4.1 Problems linked to beneficiaries

*Technische Sammlungen Dresden*

TSD made a miscalculation from the very start of the project. They were not able to deliver the work on Work package 3 and gave it back to the consortium.

TSD also made a miscalculation in numbers of records, the first estimation was 4,500 records, already during the meeting in Cologne it became clear that there was a double with MLK and that TSD was not going to reach those numbers. The estimation was brought back to 2,250 records. After a long and thorough discussion, we concluded that they were only going to deliver between 1,000 and 1,300 records. A financial agreement was settled between the Coordinator FOMU and TSD. Taking into account the reduced number of objects TSD would respect a maximum project cost claim of 55,426 euro. After already have been returning 11,301 euro on prefinancing to Picturae for taking over WP-leadership in WP3, TSD returned another 16,965,70 euro to the Daguerreobase-account.

*eDAVID (WPL7)*

eDAVID has a core assignment in the city of Antwerp they cannot ignore. After the extension of the project, they had to work on that part of their business. We have discussed this matter and have mutually decided that the best solution would be that eDAVID handed over the work and its hours to one or some of the other consortium partners. Therefore FOMU wrote the business plan and NFM tested the database. In total they gave back 10 person/months to the consortium, which stands for approximately 37,500 euro.

*MOCED*

The difficulties with MOCED have already been discussed at the second technical review and the former report. We tried to retrieve the money by hiring a Belgium bailiff, but they could not retrieve money in the Netherlands. As an association working under Belgian law, FOMU cannot hire a Dutch bailiff.
4.3.4.2. Europeana-ingestion

Elviera Velghe, director of FOMU, signed the Europeana contract on July 7, 2014 and the contribution of 10,000 euro was paid the very same month.

New persons on the project in period 3

- FOMU has reinforced its Daguerreobase-team with the following in house personnel. All these persons are under contract as employee:
  Elviera Velghe (Director)
  Nathalie Cleynhens (administration and logistic assistance)
  Ching Wan Yip (financials)
  Sofie Meuwes (restaurator, WP5)
  Lander Van Neygen (documentalist, Daguerreobase equipment, WP5)
  Michiel Demaeght (documentalist, Daguerreobase literature, WP5)
  Inneke Daghelet (Library, Daguerreobase literature, WP5)
  Isabelle Willems (Communication, WP2)

- NFM: in order to reach the targets the following persons were added to the team:
  in house:
  R. Visschedijk
  A.v. Hooijdonk
  Roxanne Van Kooten
  A. Behrens
  M. van de Zandschulp,
  M. Claase
  S. de Vries

  In order to find content abroad the services of the following persons were hired:
  S. Laier Henriksen, Barzu paula Cataline, Lidja Pajevik, and Tristam Bruce.
### 4.4. Indicators Period 1, 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator n°</th>
<th>Relating to which project objective/expected result</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Method of measurement</th>
<th>Period 1 Planned/Actual</th>
<th>Period 2 Planned/actual</th>
<th>Period 3 Planned</th>
<th>Period 3 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Effective overall project coordination</td>
<td>Number of plenary meetings</td>
<td>Meetings held</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4/5 (cumul)</td>
<td>5 (cum.)</td>
<td>6 (cum.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Effective overall project coordination</td>
<td>Number of deliverables</td>
<td>1st Periodic Report and first Annual Project Report, including financial statement</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Periodic project report and second annual Project Report, incl. financial statement</td>
<td>Final Project report and Final Financial Report</td>
<td>To be submitted by December 31st, 2015 and 30 days after receipt of final payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Blank in DoW</td>
<td>Blank in DoW</td>
<td>Blank in DoW</td>
<td>Blank in DoW</td>
<td>Blank in DoW</td>
<td>Blank in DoW</td>
<td>Blank in DoW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Number of awareness raising meetings</td>
<td>Meetings held</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Number of workshops (cumulative)</td>
<td>Workshops held</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0 (cum.)</td>
<td>1 (Cum.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Articles and presentations/posters on the project</td>
<td>number of articles or presentations</td>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>8-10/18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Informative booklets on daguerreotypes</td>
<td>number of booklets</td>
<td>9/ 7 translated</td>
<td>9/5 on line</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>New content providers/partners</td>
<td>Number of new content providers/partners, institutional and private</td>
<td>10/13</td>
<td>20/33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Number of press releases</td>
<td>press briefings</td>
<td>16/2</td>
<td>16/20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Number of standards published</td>
<td>Deliverables submitted</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Number of links from other websites</td>
<td>Websites links</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>2/400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of awareness raising and dissemination activities</td>
<td>Number of announcements/mentions in press and other media</td>
<td>Press or other media mention</td>
<td>5/23</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice and consensus building</td>
<td>Number of best practice Report</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice and consensus building</td>
<td>Number of best practice recommendations - IPR guidelines Report</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practice and consensus building</td>
<td>Number of best practice recommendations - Online manuals and instructions Report</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content providing</td>
<td>Number of new items in Europeana by partners</td>
<td>Partner and Europeana records</td>
<td>3500/0</td>
<td>13000-19000/39</td>
<td>15.000-25.000</td>
<td>15.923 in DAG/12.711 in Europeana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content providing: interoperability</td>
<td>Number of Europeana by partners</td>
<td>Europeana records</td>
<td>-/0</td>
<td>250/0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of content</td>
<td>Number of third party uses of linked data store</td>
<td>Review of linked data stores</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>25/96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of content</td>
<td>Number of third party uses of linked data store</td>
<td>Usage tracking</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>7/960</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of content</td>
<td>Number of linked data triples published in linked data store</td>
<td>Usage tracking</td>
<td>100/0</td>
<td>1500/534</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of content</td>
<td>Page views</td>
<td>Google analytics</td>
<td>5.000/2.263 – 9.453</td>
<td>100.000/12.000</td>
<td>700.000</td>
<td>112.083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of content</td>
<td>Visits or sessions</td>
<td>Google Analytics</td>
<td>800/327-876</td>
<td>6000/3522</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>18.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of content</td>
<td>Unique visitors</td>
<td>Google analytics</td>
<td>200/331-704</td>
<td>4000/4620</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>13.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of content</td>
<td>Average visit duration</td>
<td>Google analytics</td>
<td>0:01:00/00:03:79</td>
<td>0:02:00/0:04:47</td>
<td>00:04:00</td>
<td>00:05:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Explanation of indicators**

General remark on the performance-monitoring table (Indicators)

A thorough examination of the performance-monitoring table shows that some indicators were completed in a cumulative way (e.g. indicator 1), and others in a non-cumulative way (e.g. indicator 4). This can lead to confusion. As a consequence we hereby include a detailed explanation of these indicators.

**Indicator 1: number of plenary meetings**

*This indicator is cumulative which means that 2 plenary meetings were planned in Period 1, 2 more in period 2, and a final meeting in period 3. For the entire project 5 meetings were planned.*

In period 1 two plenary meetings were held and five PMB’s. The need was felt to meet more frequently than planned in the DoW. The PMB’s planned for months 15, 20, 25 will still take place and will be given additional milestone numbers (MS 15-16 etcetera).

In period 2, three Project management boards and three consortium meetings were organized.

In period 3 only one Project Management Board and one consortium meeting was organized at the end of the project in December 2015. Communication was done by mail, telephone and Basecamp in order to save time and money.

**Indicator 2: Number of deliverables**

The final periodic report including financial statement to be delivered 60 days after the ending of the second project period which is December 31st, 2015. Due to unforeseen circumstances a delay of one month was agreed upon by the PO (January 31st).

The Final Financial report needs to be submitted 30 days after receipt of the final payment (date yet unknown).

**Indicator 3: missing in DoW**

**Indicator 4: number of awareness raising meetings**

*This indicator is cumulative*

In the performance monitoring table 5 Awareness Raising Meetings are mentioned while in the milestones table on page 25 in Annex I Description of Work only 4 are mentioned. Also in the eligible cost-breakdown table on page 77, part B of Annex I only 4 Awareness Raising Meetings are budgeted.

All Awareness Raising meetings were organized in Period 2. No Awareness Raising meetings were planned in Period 3.

**Indicator 5: Number of workshops**

*This indicator is cumulative*
For the entire project one workshop should be organized, and not one in every period. There were no workshops organized in period 1. In order to give priority to the main objectives of the project (number of items in Daguerreobase and Europeana) it was decided to postpone the workshop in Paris to 2015.

A best practice workshop was held in Paris in October 2013 where the website and the collection management system was presented to and consequently tested and commented by the consortium.

In October 8 and 9, 2015, Daguerreobase and EDA organized ‘The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015’ in Bry-sur-Marne. This was an international symposium, which attracted a large international audience known in the field of photographic heritage worldwide.

**Indicator 6: Articles and presentations/posters on the project**

*This indicator is cumulative*

For period 2, 8-10 were planned, and 18 realized.

Since this indicator is cumulative the target of 15 articles and presentations was already reached in period 2.

In Period 3 two more presentations on the project were organized:

- On September 27th, Sandra Maria Petrillo (SMP) gave a presentation at the Daguerreian Society Symposium in Ausin, USA.
- An additional Daguerreobase-presentation was held by Agnes Wijers on ‘The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015’ at Bry-sur-Marne.

**Indicator 7**

*This indicator is cumulative.*

Nine booklets will be created for the entire project period and not 9 in every period.

After the unofficial rejection of the booklet during the kick-off meeting in April 2013, A new English master booklet was approved after the first technical review. This version was sent to the beneficiaries for translation and design.

Currently nine versions can be consulted on [www.daguerreobase.org](http://www.daguerreobase.org): English, Danish, French, Spanish, Italian, German, Finnish, Norwegian, and Czech.
Indicator 8: Number of new content providers

In period 1, WP5-ledaer reported 13 new content providers
In period 2, another 33 new content providers were added
In period 3 another 267 collections/content providers were added to Daguerreobase.

In total 313 collections are ingested in Daguerreobase.

Indicator 9: number of press releases

This indicator is cumulative.
In period 1 sixteen press releases were issued.
In period 2 another 13 press releases were issued to promote the communication events (awareness raising meetings and other events).

UPV launched a press release with a call for European daguerreotypes in October 2013.
Several media also reproduced this call. I refer to annex 4.3 for the detailed list.
FOMU: the FOMU newsletter of February 2014 contained a call for daguerreotypes: daguerreotypes wanted. This ‘call’ was reproduced by several websites.

In period 3 new press releases were issued by several partners to announce each new edition of the Daguerreobase Journal, the Europeana Virtual Daguerreotype Exhibition, and to promote the Conservation Workshop held at Bry-sur-Marne.

Indicator 10: number of standards published

This indicator is not cumulative.
Four standards had to be published in period 1. The submission of these four deliverables got delayed to period 2 and they got approved.

Indicator 11: number of links from other websites

This indicator is not cumulative.
In period 1 sixteen websites links should refer to Daguerreobase. In period 2 and 3 two extra links should be added per period.
In the first project period 17 weblinks were mentioned. In Period 2 the number of links has increased significantly: a search on Daguerreobase in Google gave 2660 results. A search for Daguerreobase photographic heritage project: 471 results. When we looked at content references we defined 400 sites as valuable.
For Period 3 176 websites referred to Daguerreobase during period 3 (google analytics).
**Indicator 12: number of announcements/mentions in press and other media**

23 mentions in press and other media were recorded in period 1.

For period 2 an additional 2 mentions were required, and we got one television appearance and three articles in printed media (4 mentions). We did not take into account the mentions in digital newsletters or other digital media.

For period 3 we would like to share the press report for the Virtual Exhibition

**SMP_PRESS REPORT for The virtual exhibition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEBSITE / USERS</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europeana Blog</td>
<td><a href="http://blog.europeana.eu/2015/02/photography-on-a-silver-plate/">http://blog.europeana.eu/2015/02/photography-on-a-silver-plate/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://blog.europeana.eu/tag/virtual-exhibition/">http://blog.europeana.eu/tag/virtual-exhibition/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europeana @Europeanaeu</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/Europeanaeu/status/570246287502798848">https://twitter.com/Europeanaeu/status/570246287502798848</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LChase &amp; IBradford @2nerdyhistgirls</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/2nerdyhistgirls/status/570991971625381890">https://twitter.com/2nerdyhistgirls/status/570991971625381890</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondazione Scienza e Tecnica</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fstfirenze.it/pagina-principale/91-eventi">http://www.fstfirenze.it/pagina-principale/91-eventi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KREUZBERG’D</td>
<td><a href="http://kreuzberged.com/2015/02/25/photography-on-a-silver-plate/">http://kreuzberged.com/2015/02/25/photography-on-a-silver-plate/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Blogs @BerlinBlogs</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/BerlinBlogs/status/570591558719950849">https://twitter.com/BerlinBlogs/status/570591558719950849</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Morley @PhotosOfThePast</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/photosofthepast/statuses/561116171123294210">https://twitter.com/photosofthepast/statuses/561116171123294210</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriella Paolini @GabiPaolini</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/GabiPaolini/status/645939808032919552">https://twitter.com/GabiPaolini/status/645939808032919552</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manovich @manovich</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/manovich/status/645643839185797122">https://twitter.com/manovich/status/645643839185797122</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliyana Nedkova @IliyanaNedkova</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/IliyanaNedkova/status/645568239272099841">https://twitter.com/IliyanaNedkova/status/645568239272099841</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Jørgensen @DollyJørgensen</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/DollyJorgensen/status/643752545433845760">https://twitter.com/DollyJorgensen/status/643752545433845760</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Hidy @silverplateloril</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/silverplateloril/status/628955222673637376">https://twitter.com/silverplateloril/status/628955222673637376</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>URL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Eltzroth @galpix</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/galpix/status/597768413604237312">https://twitter.com/galpix/status/597768413604237312</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cindiforeman @cindiforema</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/cindiforeman/status/586190060128755712">https://twitter.com/cindiforeman/status/586190060128755712</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotosyn @fotosynimaging</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/fotosynimaging/status/576502004677283840">https://twitter.com/fotosynimaging/status/576502004677283840</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Fedele @webargentarius</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/webargentarius/status/575747913143480320">https://twitter.com/webargentarius/status/575747913143480320</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jens Petter Kollhøj @jepeko</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/jepeko/status/573077901345759232">https://twitter.com/jepeko/status/573077901345759232</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasjonalbibioteket @Nasjonalbibl</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/Nasjonalbibl/status/573056532696469505">https://twitter.com/Nasjonalbibl/status/573056532696469505</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums of the World @MuseumsTweets</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/MuseumsTweets/status/572711391058137088">https://twitter.com/MuseumsTweets/status/572711391058137088</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBC PhotoTIPS @FBCPhotoTIPS</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/FBCPhotoTIPS/status/571018117482217473">https://twitter.com/FBCPhotoTIPS/status/571018117482217473</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foto Beni Culturali</td>
<td><a href="https://www.facebook.com/FotoBeniCulturali/posts/796548510399979">https://www.facebook.com/FotoBeniCulturali/posts/796548510399979</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NotMsParker @NotMsParker</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/NotMsParker/status/570521919667048448">https://twitter.com/NotMsParker/status/570521919667048448</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Jouvenaux @EJouv</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/EJouv/status/570345977128751104">https://twitter.com/EJouv/status/570345977128751104</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Daily Mirror @LATdailymirror</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/LATdailymirror/status/570259823305994243">https://twitter.com/LATdailymirror/status/570259823305994243</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus Trapp @textundblog</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/textundblog/status/570255137949818880">https://twitter.com/textundblog/status/570255137949818880</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitu culture @mituculture</td>
<td><a href="https://twitter.com/mituculture/status/570229872745795584">https://twitter.com/mituculture/status/570229872745795584</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 13: number of best practice
This indicator is identical to indicator 10 and refers to the four standards

Indicator 14: number of best practice recommendations – IPR guidelines
IPR-guidelines were included in deliverable D7.3. This deliverable was approved.

Indicator 15: number of best practice recommendations – Online manual and instructions
The English manual is online.

Indicator 16: number of new items in Europeana by partners
This indicator is cumulative.
The number of 3500 for period 1 was not reached in the first project period. For period 2 a number of 13,000 – 19,000 new items in Europeana by partners was not reached either. On June 25th 5142 records were in Memorix Maior and 5025 published on the Daguerreobase- website. At the end of Period 2 no content has been ingested to Europeana, which was due to the fact that there was still no signed subcontracting-agreement between Daguerreobase and Europeana. The founding of EDA in period 2 resolved the DEA issue with Europeana. The contract with Europeana was signed in July 2014. At the time of the Technical review on December 3rd, 2015 15.080 Daguerreobase-objects were in Daguerreobase, representing 34,787 images. 12,711 objects were harvested by Europeana. On top of that 9710 pages of literature were added, and 72 items of equipment. On 21 January 15.923 daguerreobase objects were in Daguerreobase, there are many more records available, which will be ingested in the upcoming time.
**Indicator 17: number of Europeana daguerreotype items in Daguerreobase**

For period 2 a number of 250 Europeana daguerreotype items in Daguerreobase was required. This objective was not met. For period 3 an amount of 1000 items must be reached.

We refer to the Europeana issue. A subcontract was closed with Europeana on July 4, 2014 (Period 3). Once the first ingestion of Daguerreobase records has been established, action will be undertaken to realize the ingestion of 1000 Europeana daguerreotype items in Daguerreobase. Research done in the Europeana portal indicates that at present only 509 daguerreotype-linked are depicted (daguerreotype-objects and pictures of daguerreotype-equipment). This indicator was not met.

**Indicator 18: usage of content. Number of third party uses of linked data store.**

*This indicator is cumulative.*

In period 2 25 are required and another 25 in period 3 in order to end up with 50.

According to google analytics there were 96 websites referring to Daguerreobase during period 2.

For Period 3 176 websites referred to Daguerreobase during period 3 (google analytics)

**Indicator 19: number of third party uses of linked data store. Review of linked data stores**

*This indicator is cumulative*

In period 2 a figure of 7 is required and another 8 in period 3 in order to end up with 15.

If the question is how many parties are being linked via linked open data, than the answer is 0 in period 2.

For period 3 the final number is 17 third party uses of linked data store.
Indicator 20: number of linked data triples publishes in linked data store

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Number of times usage of Linked Open data (field Subject Location)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCP</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoMu</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFM</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiB</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAAL</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Links to other data sources (like Wikipedia and Library of Congress Subject Headings) in Memorix Maior are 534, which is below the required 1500. This is about the field ‘Subject Location’. This field contains information about the location where the recording has been done. Partners have used this field Linked Open data 534 times. See the list below for the names of the partners.

Indicators 21-24: Google analytics

Period 1

Google Analytics data - usage of Daguerreobase.org webpage (month 1 - 9):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month of Year</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Unique Visitors</th>
<th>Page views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/11</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>2,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/12</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/01</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>7,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/02</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>4,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/03</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/04</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>3,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/05</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/06</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>5,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/07</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>9,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Google analytics data from the old website are not available anymore in period 2 and 3. But the figures of the new website are of course more relevant:

- Indicator 21: page views. For period 3 a number of 700,000 page views was expected, but we reached 112,083 page views.
- Indicator 22: visits or sessions: 18,500, which is below the required 40,000
- Indicator 23: unique visitors: 13,500 which is below the required 20,000
- Indicator 24: average visit duration: 5 minutes and 5 seconds which is longer than the planned 4 minutes

These numbers show that Daguerreobase needs to work on the exposure of the database and thus broaden her viewers. It also shows that Daguerreobase is an asset for professionals, who already can not imagine to lack this tool.
4.5. Use of resources

This part is only mandatory for projects using *actual cost re-imbursement*. The tables below are given for reference and explanations. A spreadsheet version of the tables will be provided, which should be filled and uploaded.

**Overview Person-Month Status (cumulative for period 1, 2 and 3)**

*Actual* = number of person months consumed from the beginning of the project to the end of this period  
*Planned* = total effort planned for the project in the latest version of the description of work - annex I to the grant agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium</th>
<th>WP1</th>
<th>WP2</th>
<th>WP3</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nr</td>
<td>short name</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinator/FoMu</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NFM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACRP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MLK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CNA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UIB</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Picturae</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>19.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>eDAVID</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MOCED</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NTM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UPV</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KBDK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33.29</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>42.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cells coloured in yellow, green and blue indicate the transfer of P/m’s between beneficiaries in comparison to the initial DoW.
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## Overview Person-Month Status for period 3 only (after transfer of tasks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>short name</th>
<th>WP1 Actual</th>
<th>WP1 Planned</th>
<th>WP2 Actual</th>
<th>WP2 Planned</th>
<th>WP3 Actual</th>
<th>WP3 Planned</th>
<th>WP4 Actual</th>
<th>WP4 Planned</th>
<th>WP5 Actual</th>
<th>WP5 Planned</th>
<th>WP6 Actual</th>
<th>WP6 Planned</th>
<th>WP7 Actual</th>
<th>WP7 Planned</th>
<th>TOTAL Actual</th>
<th>TOTAL Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinator/ FoMu</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NFM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACRP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MLK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CNA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UfB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pictuae</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>eDAVID</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MOCED</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NTM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UPV</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KBDK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>57.44</td>
<td>177.50</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td>95.77</td>
<td>404.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 328.05 p/m (81%) were consumed of the planned 404 p/m. 75.95 p/m or 19% are not registered. The third period includes a suspension period of 6 months. During this period some beneficiaries kept working on the project, but could not claim these efforts in the project.
This table shows that the registered p/m are below planned level for work packages 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Planned person-months have been exceeded on work package 1 and work package 2. But in total only 81% of all p/m’s have been consumed.
The following beneficiaries have passed the indicate person-months: FOMU (+3.71 p/m), Picturae (+7.9 p/m), MCS (1.37 p/m), UPV (+4.3 p/m) and KBDK (+1.57 p/m). For MOCED a correction has been done in DOW, but there has been no correction in the actual p/m’s.

The other beneficiaries have not registered the awarded person-months.

**Comments the use of resources in the Third Project Period**
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Total hours performed in total on the project is confirmed by timesheets for a vast majority of the beneficiaries. For some beneficiaries there is no supervisor to sign the timesheets, since they are the director of their own company. The registration of these hours has not always been allocated correctly to the different work packages, but there are no dramatic effects in the totality of the project.

For period 3 a total of 95.77 p/m was registered. Hours performed during the suspension period are not registered in Daguerreobase. For the entire project period a total of 328 p/m out of 404 person/months, or 81% of the planned person-months have been registered. Almost 76 p/m are left unconsumed in the project.

The actual person/months per work package is being compared with the indicative person/months in the DoW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual person-months</th>
<th>Indicative person-months for already approved deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1: 33,29 p/m</td>
<td>20 p/m for 3 approved deliverables, two more submitted (10 p/m) waiting for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2: 60,24 p/m</td>
<td>22 p/m for 3 approved deliverables, two more submitted (26,50 p/m) waiting for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3: 30,50 p/m</td>
<td>48 p/m for 5 (all) approved deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4: 33,35 p/m</td>
<td>23,50 p/m for 2 approved deliverables, two more submitted (19 p/m) waiting for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5: 139,37 p/m</td>
<td>11,50 p/m for 6 approved deliverables, one more submitted (166 p/m) waiting for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6: 9,14 p/m</td>
<td>10,30 p/m for 3 approved deliverable, three more submitted (11,70 p/m) waiting for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7: 21,87</td>
<td>16,50 p/m for 3 approved deliverables, one more submitted (19 p/m) waiting for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT: 328 p/m</td>
<td>151,80 p/m (252,20 p/m available for the remaining submitted deliverables waiting for approval)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we take a look at the approved deliverables only, they valid 151,80 persons/months for 25 approved deliverables. An additional 176,20 p/m are registered for the remaining submitted deliverables waiting for approval with an indicative effort of 252.20 p/m;
Work Package 1:

In period 3 9,66 p/m were registered and for the total project 33.29 p/m were registered by the coordinator which is 3,29 p/m above the indicative person/months of 30 p/m. The coordinator is the only partner allowed to register WP1 hours.

D1.1 and D1.2 and D1.3, are approved and count for 20 p/m
Preparing the D1.4 Final project report and D1.5 final Financial report : 10 p/months. Preparing one board meetings and one technical review in Amsterdam.

In period 3 9,66 p/m were registered and for the total project 33.29 p/m were registered by the coordinator which is 3,29 p/m above the indicative person/months of 30 p/m. The coordinator is the only partner allowed to register WP1 hours.

D1.1 and D1.2 and D1.3, are approved and count for 20 p/m
Preparing the D1.4 Final project report and D1.5 final Financial report : 10 p/months. Preparing one board meetings and one technical review in Amsterdam.
Work package 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 3 short name</th>
<th>WP2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinator FoMu</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NFM</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACRP</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MLK</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TSD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CNA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. IPR</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FMP</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. UiB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Picturae</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. eDAVID</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MOCED</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SMP</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. MCS</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NTM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. UPV</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. KBDK</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For period 3 only, 13.98 p/m were registered. For the entire project 61.33 person-months were registered while 48.50 p/m were planned.
Comments on work package 2:

In period 3 13,98 p/m were registered 3,82 p/m (or 27%) was registered by the coordinator FOMU and 6,25 p/m 45% by WP2-leader SMP. For the entire 61,33 p/m was registered.

In period 3 the following deliverables have been submitted: D2.4 Daguerreotype Journal (15 p/m) and D2.5 (11,50 Europeana Virtual Daguerreotype Exhibition. Also milestone 8 from period 1 ‘The Daguerreotype and Conservation Workshop’ was still on the list to be organised and took place in period 3.

For the entire project a lot of beneficiaries have exceeded the planned person-months for WP2. This work package demanded a high involvement of every beneficiary: organising awareness raising meetings in period 2 (SMP, NTM, FMP and ARCP), creating a booklet, writing and sending press releases, organizing networking events and giving presentations, writing articles for the Journals and national publications, sending in pictures for the virtual exhibition.

The change of WP2-leader (from MOCED to SMP) has also lead to a surplus of hours, since a lot of work had to be redone by the new WP2-leader and the coordinator. Finally, a small amount of the hours registered in WP2 are in fact WP1-hours. None of the beneficiaries, with exception of the coordinator, has been given person-months in WP1 for administrative tasks a lot of beneficiaries have been registering administrative and financial tasks on WP2.

SMP has put a lot of effort in creating a high quality Daguerreotype Journal with well written articles from international experts. After designing the Europeana Virtual daguerreotype Exhibition, Europeana refused to accept the original concept. A lot of work had to be redone in order to meet the limitations from Europeana.

The Daguerreotype and Conservation workshop had been postponed for several reasons, as explained in the previous progress reports. The coordinator FOMU and SMP joined forces to create an event to promote Daguerreobase and EDA and to persuade important institutes to collaborate and to provide content. The organisation of the Daguerreotype Symposium 2015 took a lot of energy, but the outcomes were very positive as it permitted to add some very important collections into Daguerreobase.

NFM has done promotional and networking activities (e.g. London Fair) in period 3. ARCP has dedicated time to the virtual exhibition and more networking activities. MLK has writing press articles (Press Department), networking and administration. IPR has done networking activities, writing an article on Daguerreobase in the internationally distributed journal of the Technical Museum Vienna (FORUM) to be published in January/February 2016. FMP has been contacting Finnish and foreign daguerreotype owns to take part in the virtual exhibition, wrote an article for the Journal, communicated the Daguerreotype Symposium (advertisement). MCS did a lot of proofreading for WP2-activities (Journal, Exhibition, Symposium), networking and promotion (leaflet distribution) at several events. UPV contributed to the exhibition and the Journal, communicated on social media, and promoted the symposium. KBDK has created a Danish folder and used it alongside an exhibition of original daguerreotypes in The Black Diamond.
For period 3 a total of 1.51 p/m was registered.
For the entire project 29.33 person-months were registered while 48 p/m were planned.
Comments on Work package 3

For period 3 a total of 1,51 p/m was registered. For the entire project 29.33 person-months were registered while 48 p/m were planned.

For work package 3 no more deliverables were planned for period 3.

Main WP3-activities in period 3 were additional translation work of SKOS terms and guidelines, additional data correction of conversion mistakes of entries in old daguerreotypes. Some of the partners registered the technical review meeting under WP3 because of the lack of WP1 hours.
Work package 4

For the entire project 33.35 p/m person-months were registered while 42.5 p/m were planned. For period 3 a total of 3.12 p/m was registered.
Comments on WP4

WP4: no deliverables planned in period 3. But since no response had come on D4.3 reports of acceptance testing, D4.5 Web services and functionality Report, we have resubmitted them in Period 3.

For the entire project 33,35 p/m person-months were registered while 42,5 p/m were planned. For period 3 a total of 3,12 p/m was registered.

Picturae registered hours on technical issues of the website reported by different beneficiaries. NFM (Boudewijn Ridder) has done work on website improvements. MLK has been checking the multilingual manuals and guidelines, discussions on SKOS terms, problems with the interface and Memorix (Comments facility, description of owners, …)
For period 3 a total of 57.44 p/m was registered. For the entire project 139.48 p/m person-months (79%) were registered while 177.5 p/m were planned.
Comments on WP5

For the entire project 139.48 p/m person-months were registered while 177.5 p/m were planned. For period 3 a total of 57.44 p/m was registered.

This work package has been suffering a serious delay from the start of the project.

In Period 1 a delay was caused by a poor decision of the board that decided not to ingest content in the old Daguerreobase and wait for the new Daguerreobase to be launched. The development of the Collection Management System got delayed and, as a consequence, also the ingestion into the Daguerreobase. Also the Europeana-issue has prevented ingestion until the beginning of period 3.

Once the Europeana contract got signed all beneficiaries went after signed DDEA-contracts in order to have their own collections and the collections of other institutes and private-collectors ingested. At the time of the Technical review on December 3rd, 2015 15,080 Daguerreobase-objects were in Daguerreobase, representing 34,787 images. 12,711 objects were harvested by Europeana. On top of that 9710 pages of literature were added, and 72 items of equipment.

On 21 January 15,923 daguerreobase objects were in Daguerreobase, there are many more records available, which will be ingested in the upcoming time.

9710 pages of literature (6825 planned) and 72 pieces of equipment (43 planned) were entered in Daguerreobase.

The table on the next page shows in detail the work achieved by several beneficiaries.
Work package 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period 3 short name</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinator FoMu</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NFM</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACRP</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MLK</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TSD</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CNA</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. IPR</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FMP</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NB</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. UiB</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Picturae</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. eDAVID</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MOCED</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SMP</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. MCS</td>
<td>0,23</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NTM</td>
<td>1,11</td>
<td>8,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. UPV</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. KBDK</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>22,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For period 3 a total of 2,79 p/m was registered. For the entire project 9,40 p/m person-months (42.7%) were registered while 22 p/m were planned.
Comments on Work package 6

We can only repeat that this percentage unfortunately reflects the fact that not enough efforts are put into ‘project performance and evaluation’. The re-submitted deliverables showed some improvement but did not affect the work process.

Although on an individual level contacts were good with NTM there were difficulties partially due to a distance and language barrier, but also of very different company culture with a lot of bureaucracy.

Some beneficiaries registered hours on this work package for administration and reporting, meeting preparations, studying results and achievements.
Work package 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short name</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinator FoMu</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NFM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACRP</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MLK</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TSD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CNA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. IPR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FMP</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. UiB</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Picture</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. eDAVID</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MOCED</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SMP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. MCS</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NTM</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. UPV</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. KBKD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>35.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For period 3 only, 7.27 p/m were registered. For the entire period 21.87 p/m or 61.6% or of the planned 35.50 person-month have been registered.

Comments on WP7
The approved deliverables D7.1 (7 p/m), D7.2 (4.5 p/m) and D7.3 (5 p/m), validate 18.5 p/m for the entire consortium.

In the previous report issues with regard to WP7 were signalled and the coordinator gave the WP7-leader an ultimatum (deliver or leave). This led to an agreement that eDAVID returned 10 person-months to the consortium. Work left for the last deliverable was taken up by NFM and the coordinator FOMU.

Some beneficiaries registered hours on this work package related to Eda-issues, investigating grants, Europeana-rights issues.
Use of resources consortium: personnel costs and other costs for the third and last project period.

In this third period a total amount of 508.520,00 euro was spent on Daguerreobase. Although no subcontracting was foreseen in this project two partners reported subcontracting.

FOMU paid 10.000 euro to Europeana for the harvesting of its data. Due to a misunderstanding in the negotiation phase, this was not budgeted in the DoW budget breakdown, although it was necessary and vital. This was agreed with the project officer.

NFM has appointed some persons to find content abroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personnel Costs</th>
<th>Sub Contracting</th>
<th>Other Direct costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>requested funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FoMu</td>
<td>116.949,00</td>
<td>10.000,00</td>
<td>21.936,00</td>
<td>148.885,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NFM</td>
<td>100.365,00</td>
<td>6.999,00</td>
<td>4.216,00</td>
<td>111.580,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCP</td>
<td>2.914,00</td>
<td>548,00</td>
<td>3.462,00</td>
<td>2.769,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MLK</td>
<td>72.812,00</td>
<td>985,00</td>
<td>73.797,00</td>
<td>59.037,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>1.250,00</td>
<td>447,00</td>
<td>1.697,00</td>
<td>1.357,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CNA</td>
<td>510,00</td>
<td></td>
<td>510,00</td>
<td>408,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>22.196,00</td>
<td>653,00</td>
<td>22.849,00</td>
<td>18.279,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>9.276,00</td>
<td>1.970,00</td>
<td>11.246,00</td>
<td>8.996,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>7.818,00</td>
<td>500,00</td>
<td>8.318,00</td>
<td>6.654,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UIB</td>
<td>321,00</td>
<td>549,00</td>
<td>870,00</td>
<td>696,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PIM</td>
<td>5.831,00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.831,00</td>
<td>4.664,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>eDAVID</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MOCED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>27.875,00</td>
<td>3.296,00</td>
<td>31.171,00</td>
<td>24.936,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>34.554,00</td>
<td>9.147,00</td>
<td>43.701,00</td>
<td>34.960,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NTM</td>
<td>4.171,00</td>
<td>522,00</td>
<td>4.693,00</td>
<td>3.754,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UPV</td>
<td>9.452,00</td>
<td>221,00</td>
<td>9.673,00</td>
<td>7.738,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KBDK</td>
<td>29.004,00</td>
<td>1.233,00</td>
<td>30.237,00</td>
<td>24.189,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>445.298,00</td>
<td>16.999,00</td>
<td>46.223,00</td>
<td>508.520,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table above reflects the total of all costs claimed for the entire project. A total of 1.874.960,00 euro was budgeted, but with an actual total of 1.613.809 euro there is still 261.153 euro left. This does not take into account.

If we also take into account the rejected subcontracting and personnel costs (23.476,00 euro) during the EC Assessment a total cost of 1.590.333,00 euro applies. This means a consumption of 84,8 % of the budgeted costs.

---

**Daguerreobase 297250: Cost claims period 1, 2 and 3 (1/12/2012-31/10/2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>FoMu</th>
<th>Personnel Costs</th>
<th>10.000,00</th>
<th>Sub Contracting</th>
<th>45.410,00</th>
<th>Other Direct costs</th>
<th>386.995,00</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>309.595,00</th>
<th>max EU contribution</th>
<th>360.683,00</th>
<th>DOW Total Costs</th>
<th>288.544,58</th>
<th>DoW minus actual total costs</th>
<th>-26.312,00</th>
<th>Actual/DoW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FoMu</td>
<td>331.585,00</td>
<td>10.000,00</td>
<td>45.410,00</td>
<td>386.995,00</td>
<td>309.595,00</td>
<td>360.683,00</td>
<td>288.544,58</td>
<td>-26.312,00</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NFM</td>
<td>225.981,00</td>
<td>10.187,00</td>
<td>16.258,00</td>
<td>252.426,00</td>
<td>201.940,00</td>
<td>242.925,00</td>
<td>194.339,76</td>
<td>-9.501,00</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARCP</td>
<td>25.436,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1.609,00</td>
<td>27.045,00</td>
<td>21.635,00</td>
<td>34.177,00</td>
<td>27.341,34</td>
<td>7.132,00</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MLK</td>
<td>164.000,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>6.534,00</td>
<td>170.534,00</td>
<td>136.426,00</td>
<td>168.969,00</td>
<td>135.175,44</td>
<td>-1.565,00</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>57.977,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>2.467,00</td>
<td>60.444,00</td>
<td>48.354,00</td>
<td>159.648,00</td>
<td>127.718,80</td>
<td>99.204,00</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CNA</td>
<td>7.500,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1.294,00</td>
<td>8.794,00</td>
<td>7.034,00</td>
<td>15.717,00</td>
<td>12.573,60</td>
<td>6.923,00</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>64.188,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>2.568,00</td>
<td>66.756,00</td>
<td>53.403,00</td>
<td>66.096,00</td>
<td>52.876,95</td>
<td>-660,00</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>34.273,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>8.778,00</td>
<td>43.051,00</td>
<td>34.439,00</td>
<td>84.020,00</td>
<td>67.216,00</td>
<td>40.969,00</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>33.696,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>3.502,00</td>
<td>37.198,00</td>
<td>29.757,00</td>
<td>54.755,00</td>
<td>43.803,72</td>
<td>17.557,00</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UIB</td>
<td>15.379,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>5.790,00</td>
<td>21.169,00</td>
<td>16.934,00</td>
<td>74.597,00</td>
<td>59.677,82</td>
<td>53.428,00</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PIM</td>
<td>147.259,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>5.389,00</td>
<td>152.648,00</td>
<td>122.117,00</td>
<td>133.645,00</td>
<td>106.916,39</td>
<td>-19.003,00</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>eDAVID</td>
<td>62.234,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1.571,00</td>
<td>63.805,00</td>
<td>51.043,00</td>
<td>108.911,00</td>
<td>87.129,20</td>
<td>45.106,00</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MOCED</td>
<td>35.620,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>2.490,00</td>
<td>38.110,00</td>
<td>30.487,00</td>
<td>42.555,00</td>
<td>62.763,63</td>
<td>-13.555,00</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>62.024,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>9.863,00</td>
<td>71.887,00</td>
<td>57.508,00</td>
<td>115.304,00</td>
<td>49.123,01</td>
<td>43.417,00</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>65.038,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>11.566,00</td>
<td>76.604,00</td>
<td>61.282,00</td>
<td>71.712,00</td>
<td>57.369,60</td>
<td>-4.892,00</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NTM</td>
<td>20.592,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>8.708,00</td>
<td>29.300,00</td>
<td>23.439,00</td>
<td>46.801,00</td>
<td>37.440,92</td>
<td>17.501,00</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UPV</td>
<td>40.242,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>3.077,00</td>
<td>43.319,00</td>
<td>34.654,00</td>
<td>46.025,00</td>
<td>36.819,94</td>
<td>2.706,00</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KBDK</td>
<td>59.635,00</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>4.089,00</td>
<td>63.724,00</td>
<td>50.978,00</td>
<td>66.422,00</td>
<td>53.137,29</td>
<td>2.698,00</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.452.659,00</td>
<td>20.187,00</td>
<td>140.963,00</td>
<td>1.613.809,00</td>
<td>1.291.025,00</td>
<td>1.874.962,00</td>
<td>1.499.968,00</td>
<td>261.153,00</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subcontracting and other Costs

In period 3 a total of 16.999,00 euro have been claimed for subcontracting and 46.223,00 euro for other direct costs. Together this is 63.222,00 euro.

For the entire project this 20.187,00 euro subcontracting and 140.963,00 euro for other costs. Together this gives a total of 161.150,00 euro.

In the latest version of the budget breakdown a total of 182.880,00 euro was put for other costs. Subcontracting was not foreseen in the budget, although at least a subcontracting cost for Europeana should have been foreseen.

We can conclude that 21.730 euro was not consumed. If you take into account the EC assessment this number gets raised with 8206 and we end with 29.936,00 euro.

CIP – 297250 – Daguerreobase – Progress report
Total cost minus EC Assessment is 1.590.333,00 euro (84,8 %).

Personnel cost minus EC Assessment (15.270,00 euro, Moced) give a total personnel cost of 1.437.389,00 euros (85%).

Subcontracting and other costs EC Assessment (8.206,00 euro, Moced) give a total of 152.944,00 euro (83%).
The table below shows the total costs versus the planned costs per beneficiary (not taking into account the EC Assessment of period 1 and period 2).
Comments per beneficiary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Personnel Costs</th>
<th>Sub Contracting</th>
<th>Other Direct costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>max EU contribution (P3-8)</th>
<th>DOE Total Costs</th>
<th>max EU Contribution</th>
<th>DOE minus actual total costs</th>
<th>Actual/DOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOMU</td>
<td>331,585.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>45,410.00</td>
<td>386,995.00</td>
<td>309.595.00</td>
<td>360,683.00</td>
<td>288,544.58</td>
<td>-76,132.00</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>25,436.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,609.00</td>
<td>27,045.00</td>
<td>21,635.00</td>
<td>34,177.00</td>
<td>27,341.34</td>
<td>-7,235.76</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK</td>
<td>164,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,324.00</td>
<td>170,324.00</td>
<td>136,426.00</td>
<td>168,969.00</td>
<td>135,175.44</td>
<td>-33,793.56</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>57,977.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,467.00</td>
<td>60,444.00</td>
<td>48,554.00</td>
<td>159,848.00</td>
<td>127,718.80</td>
<td>39,029.20</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNA</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,254.00</td>
<td>8,754.00</td>
<td>7,034.00</td>
<td>15,717.00</td>
<td>12,573.60</td>
<td>3,143.40</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>64,188.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,568.00</td>
<td>66,756.00</td>
<td>53,403.00</td>
<td>66,096.00</td>
<td>52,876.95</td>
<td>-13,219.05</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>34,273.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,778.00</td>
<td>43,051.00</td>
<td>34,339.00</td>
<td>84,020.00</td>
<td>67,216.00</td>
<td>16,804.00</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>33,996.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,502.00</td>
<td>37,498.00</td>
<td>29,757.00</td>
<td>54,755.00</td>
<td>43,803.72</td>
<td>10,951.28</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBI</td>
<td>18,379.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,750.00</td>
<td>24,129.00</td>
<td>16,934.00</td>
<td>74,597.00</td>
<td>56,677.82</td>
<td>17,919.18</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMR</td>
<td>147,259.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,369.00</td>
<td>152,628.00</td>
<td>122,417.00</td>
<td>133,945.00</td>
<td>106,916.39</td>
<td>27,028.61</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDAVID</td>
<td>92,234.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,571.00</td>
<td>93,805.00</td>
<td>51,043.00</td>
<td>108,911.00</td>
<td>87,129.20</td>
<td>21,781.80</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCED</td>
<td>35,620.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
<td>38,070.00</td>
<td>30,487.00</td>
<td>24,555.00</td>
<td>21,763.63</td>
<td>-2,791.37</td>
<td>155%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP</td>
<td>62,024.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,863.00</td>
<td>71,887.00</td>
<td>57,508.00</td>
<td>115,304.00</td>
<td>49,123.01</td>
<td>66,180.99</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCS</td>
<td>65,038.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11,566.00</td>
<td>76,604.00</td>
<td>61,282.00</td>
<td>71,712.00</td>
<td>57,369.60</td>
<td>-14,342.40</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTM</td>
<td>20,392.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,708.00</td>
<td>29,300.00</td>
<td>23,439.00</td>
<td>46,801.00</td>
<td>37,440.92</td>
<td>9,360.08</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPV</td>
<td>40,242.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,077.00</td>
<td>43,319.00</td>
<td>34,654.00</td>
<td>46,035.00</td>
<td>36,819.94</td>
<td>9,215.06</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBDK</td>
<td>59,635.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,089.00</td>
<td>63,724.00</td>
<td>50,978.00</td>
<td>68,422.00</td>
<td>53,137.29</td>
<td>15,284.71</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 1,252,659.00, 20,187.00, 149,963.00, 1,613,809.00, 1,291,025.00, 1,874,962.00, 1,499,968.00, 261,153.00, 86%

The following beneficiaries have passed the indicate person-months: FOMU (+3,71 p/m), Picturae (+7,9 p/m), MCS (1,37 p/m), UPV (+4,3 p/m) and KBDK (+1,57 p/m). For MOCED a correction has been done in DOW, but there has been no correction in the actual p/m’s. The other beneficiaries have not passed their awarded person-months.

1. FOMU has exceeded its amended budget with 26,312.00 euros (+7 %) due to the following causes:

- consumption of additional p/m’s (+3,71 p/m)
- writing of D7.4 Daguerrobase business model and plan (eDAVID returned 10 p/m to consortium)
- organization of milestone 8, daguerreotype and conservation workshop, in Bry-sur-Marne
- delivery of additional content
- payment to Europeana (10,000 euros)

FOMU initially had a higher budget for ‘other costs’ but it reallocated 67,949.00 euro of this budget to the other beneficiaries, since they weren’t given any ‘other cost’-budget for attending the project meetings.

2. NFM has exceeded its budget with 9501,00 euro. More high salary-personnel was attracted in order to reach the WP5-target. Additional subcontracting was decided, which is not reflected in the consumed of person-months which stays below planned, in order to find content in Europe. NFM also exceeded the other direct costs (subcontracting, traveling and organization/catering of final technical review)
NFM transferred 2 p/m to NFM in an earlier stage of the project (WP7). In the EC assessment 3.188,00 euro (subcontracting) were rejected.

3. ARCP has respected its budget (79%) and delivered 95% of the content.

4. MLK has exceeded its budget slightly with 1.564,00 euro, and this mainly in the ‘other costs’-section. MLK attended all technical review meetings and this caused higher travel expenses. MLK has ingested 77% of the daguerreotype objects (3463), 2746 pages of literature (323%) and 19 pieces of equipment.

5. TSD: only spent 60.444,00 or 38 % of the total 159,648,00 after it became clear that TSD was not able to reach their content target of 4500 objects.

6. CNA spent 56% of its budget and delivered 95% of the content (19 objects).

7. IPR overspent its budget slightly, but also delivered additional content (1208 objects instead of 1000) and attended two technical review meetings that were not budgeted (Valencia and Rotterdam), this caused higher travel expenses.

8. FMP did spend 51,2 % of its budget, and delivered more than the planned objects (364 objects). It also respected its other costs budget, even after organizing an awareness raising meeting.

9. NB did only spend 68 % of its budget, and delivered the expected content

10. UiB did spend only one third from its budget and delivered all content.

11. Picturae has exceeded its budget with 19.003,00 euro, but their work has been vital for the project.

12. eDAVID used 58 % of its budget and still has 45.106,00 euro left. FOMU and eDAVID agreed that eDAVID would return 10 p/m to the consortium. eDAVID did not claim any costs at all in period 3.

13. MOCED still has to return the excess of pre-financing.

14. SMP had a budget increase due to the change of WP2-leadership. It has respected this increased budget and managed to double the requested amount of objects (710 instead of 350). Also organized an awareness raising meeting and co-organized ‘The Daguerreotype Symposium 2015’.

15. MCS has exceeded its budget with 4.892,00 euro, but has achieved a lot in terms of content. MCS did manage to deliver very important royal collections. He has ingested 1530 objects (1000 planned). MCS has been working with a lot of volunteers in order to limit the personnel costs.

16. NTM has spent 62,6 % of its budget and delivered 84% of the requested content. Has also respected the other costs even after organizing an awareness raising meeting and a lot of traveling to attend PMB’s and consortium meetings.
17. UPV has respected its budget (94%) and delivered 867 objects (750 planned). Hosted the second technical review at Valencia.

18. KBDK has respected the total budget and delivered additional content (810 records instead of 720 planned).