

Evaluation Summary Report

PROPOSAL : 034809
 ACRONYM : EMMA
 INSTRUMENT : STP - Specific Targeted Research Projects
 CALL : FP6-2005-IST-5
 DURATION : 36 Months
 ACTIVITY : IST-2005-2.5.10 - Access to and preservation of cultural and scientific resources
 PROGRAM : FP6

EMMA

The European Meme and Memory Agent

Proposal submitted by :

N°	Proposer Name	Country	Total Cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
1	Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft m.b.H	Austria	1374978	27.49	777571	23.91
2	Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica	Netherlands	436024	8.72	229354	7.05
3	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche	Italy	479594	9.59	248594	7.64
4	The Open University	United Kingdom	417400	8.35	417400	12.83
5	University of Twente	Netherlands	515400	10.31	268480	8.25
6	PRC Group - The Management House	Greece	494380	9.88	252958	7.78
7	Taideteollinen korkeakoulu (University of Art and Design) Media Lab	Finland	241506	4.83	241506	7.42
8	Tel Aviv University	Israel	300925	6.02	300925	9.25
9	Helsinki University of Technology	Finland	263843	5.28	263843	8.11
10	InterSoft, a. s.	Slovakia	160780	3.21	87723	2.70
11	The Interactive Institute AB	Sweden	316520	6.33	164328	5.05
TOTAL			5001350	100%	3252682	100%

Abstract :

EMMA (European Memory and Meme Agent) will create novel software components with which Memory Institutions will be able to engage the public in a rich discourse about culture and collective memory. EMMA will extend the traditional portal-style access to distributed Cultural Heritage (CH) sources by a facility for the public to add private media collections to collective memory, to add knowledge to such

collections through semantic social software, and to create engaging media presentations based on semantically guided narratives. There will be a circulating flow of information, in which the public can take the role of consumer as well as content producer.

The technical innovation of EMMA lies in combining knowledge and media management, multimedia knowledge presentation and semantically enabled social software in order to arrive at a two-way multimedia information system, in which e-communities engage in discourse far beyond the capabilities of current web technology. The major specific innovation is the idea of formalising memes to arrive at a knowledge representation of ideas and beliefs.

The project can be anthropomorphised as consisting of four agents: the communaliser, the contextualiser, the narratiser and the memetiser. Through these, content and knowledge can be encoded, enhanced by other knowledge and data, expressed using story lines for different purposes, and ultimately be made an integral part of a new cultural discourse. Giving a formal definition to the notion of memes promises to open new avenues for CH in and outside the memory institutions. The consortium brings in knowledge from other EU projects as well as from national programmes and is therefore uniquely positioned to meet EMMA's RTD challenge.

Evaluation:

<p>1 Relevance (Threshold 3/ 5 ; weight 1)</p>	<p>Mark :</p>
<p>This proposal fits with the access component of the work programme particularly with its focus on the conceptualisation, representation and workflows related to individual interactive experiences in the cultural heritage domain.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>2 Potential Impact (Threshold 3/ 5 ; weight 1)</p>	<p>Mark :</p>
<p>It is clear that tools such as those proposed here are needed and although the impact may not be revolutionary this funding process is a good place to do it through encouragement of the research programme and development of a European level process to encourage community memory involvement in culture & heritage (keeping in mind that the impact is potentially international).</p> <p>Work done on revealing the latent content structures of cultural & heritage materials and providing user tools for engaging with this would have a significant impact, providing the glue to connect individual memory and cultural experiences with professional curation activities.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>3 S and T Excellence (Threshold 4/ 5 ; weight 1)</p>	<p>Mark :</p>
<p>There was no doubt that the scientific objective is appropriate, eg development of rule based social engines, and there is potential for this project to deliver beyond the current state-of-the-art for the community groupware development sector.</p> <p>There needs to be more work on a user plan to back up the scientific endeavour so that it doesn't become a technology project for the sake of technology without first defining the nature of the problem.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>4 Quality of consortium (Threshold 3/ 5 ; weight 1)</p>	<p>Mark :</p>
<p>There is good scientific expertise in the consortium and good country representation and it was pointed out that the quality of the scientific component of the consortium should almost guarantee a successful outcome. However, there the proposal does lack demonstrated experience in interface development particularly large, multifaceted, user centric interfaces. The proposal also seems to lack partners capable of processing large collections which could result in scale issues at an EU level which raises concerns about the ability of the consortium to deliver on its desired</p>	<p>3.5</p>

stated outcome. Other issues discussed were: apparent overlaps in expertise; SME representation is marginal; lack of support for multilinguality.

5 Quality of management (Threshold 3 / 5 ; weight 1)	Mark :
<p>It was noted that this was a strong, feasible management plan personalised for this proposal including a good risk management profile. The main gap was a lack of dedicated resource for management of dissemination/exploitation of resulting IPR arising from the project.</p> <p>Not all the partners were represented at the management level which raises issues of representation and there was some concern about the core team and the lack of some members in it.</p>	4
6 Mobilisation resources (Threshold 3 / 5 ; weight 1)	Mark :
<p>There was a broad equalisation of resources but this could be an issue in that activities such as dissemination, user requirements, field experiments wouldn't necessarily be done by everyone. Other issues canvassed were: the conference cost seemed excessive in terms of the impact it might have, eg costs for publications might have a broader impact; there was no budget for the external evaluation team. The overall cost of the project seemed high (although it was suggested that a high cost may be acceptable to pursue the project) which may also be a result of layers of duplication.</p>	3
7 Overall remarks (Threshold 21 / 30)	TOTAL :
<p>In general this proposal, while needing strengthening in some parts, should provide useful research and application solutions in the area of semantic web technologies and the use of community softwares to engage user communities in a more active relationship with culture & heritage.</p>	22.5
Ethical issues question	N

0=No score due to missing/incomplete information; 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Very good; 5=Excellent (Half marks may be given)