DELIVERABLE

Project Acronym:	DCA
Grant Agreement number:	270927
Project Title:	Digitising Contemporary Art

Deliverable reference number and title

D1.1 Quality Plan

Revision: 1.0

Authors: Christine Sauter (PACKED vzw)

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the ICT Policy Support Programme		
Dissemination Level		
P	Public	
C	Confidential, only for members of the consortium and the Commission Services	x

DCA_D11_QualityPlan_20110429_V1

REVISION HISTORY AND STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

Revision History

Revision	Date	Author	Organisation	Description
0.0	1.3.11	CS	PACKED	formal creation (logo, no etc)
0.1	24.3.11	CS	PACKED	First text drafts and concept
0.1	24.4.11	CS	PACKED	Continued draft
0.1	27.4.11	EM	IBBT	Peer review
1.0	29.4.11	RV	PACKED	Final version

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise.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

Content Table

1. Executive Summary

This document provides guidelines for

- the project management procedures;

- the project structure and organisation;

- the administrative procedures.

The consortium partners will use these guidelines to support the quality assurance management of the Digitising Contemporary Art (DCA) project.

2. Introduction

2.1   Purpose of the Quality Plan

The Quality Plan defines the methods and requirements that aim to guide

- all consortium members of the Digitising Contemporary Art (DCA) project with respect to applying and adhering to the administrative procedures and rules;

- all partners involved in the quality management activities to support the quality assurance processes for satisfactory performance and successful achievements.

2.2   Reference Documents

This Quality Plan is to be seen in conjunction with the key documents of the DCA project:

- the Grant Agreement ICT PSP No. 270927;

- the Annex I - Description of Work and the Annex II of the GA;

- the Consortium Agreement.

If a conflict would arise between those key documents and the procedures defined in this Quality Plan, it should be brought to the attention of the Coordinator or the Project Management Board to be resolved accordingly.

2.3   Scope of the Quality Plan

The Quality Plan defines following issues:

- the project organisation, roles and responsibilities;

- the internal communication;

- the document management;

- the indicative meeting schedule;

- the quality control and progress monitoring;

- the quality assurance, reports and reviews;

- the risk management;

- the submission of the Deliverables.

The consortium partners must see that the work performed by their own staff is in accordance with this Quality Plan.

2.4   Abbreviations

DCA: Digitising Contemporary Art

GA: Grant Agreement

DoW: Description of Work

CA: Consortium Agreement

PO: Project Officer of the European Commission

CO: Coordinator

PMB: Project Management Board

TMG: Technical Management Group

WP: Work Package

WPL: Work Package Leader

R: Report

D: Deliverable

PM: Person Month

3. Quality Objectives

The quality objectives of the quality plan are

- assuring the quality of the project objectives and expected results;

- providing support to those partners involved in monitoring the performance, evaluating the achievements and managing risks and corrective actions throughout the project's lifecycle.

The key objectives of the DCA project are:

- to identify best practices for digitisation and metadata attribution for the different types of contemporary art objects and for the different institutional contexts;

- to digitise 26,921 contemporary artworks and 1,857 contextual documents;

- to supervise the digitisation work of the twenty-one content partners to assure a high quality outcome and interoperability with the best suited aggregation system;

- to aggregate the newly created digital reproductions for ingestion into Europeana;

- to create online access to the newly created digital reproductions;

- to provide rich metadata for online users;

- to determine long-term preservation strategies for the newly created digital reproductions (plus metadata and links);

- to disseminate the project results and the guidelines that will be produced during the project.

4. Management and Responsibilities

Consortium:

The consortium comprises twenty-one content providers, three technical partners and one Coordinator (see partner coordinates at the end of this document). The consortium will meet in plenary meetings at least twice per year. The plenary is the main decision-making body (see CA § 6.1)

Coordinator

The CO, PACKED vzw, is responsible for the overall management of the project as specified in Annex I of the GA.

The CO is the legal entity acting as the intermediary between the Parties and the European Commission. The CO shall, in addition to its responsibilities as a Party, perform the tasks assigned to it as described in the GA and the CA. As such, the CO is responsible for the overall management of the project as specified in Annex I of the GA.

Consortium bodies

Consortium bodies are additional management bodies in support of the CO, as defined in the Annex I B3.3. of the GA:

The Project Management Board (PMB)

All WPLs form together the PMB, which is led by the CO. It is the supervisory body for the project execution and reports to the Plenary Board. The tasks of the PMB are

- to discuss the joint project activities;

- to define the schedule of activities in and among the various work packages;

- to evaluate and validate the progress of the project;

- to propose corrective actions in the event of problems.

Together the PMB members ensure an effective project planning.

Each WPL has to deliver a detailed work plan for the WP for which he is responsible. Each work plan should be ready at least two weeks before the WP's starting date that is defined in the DoW. Interfaces to other WPs have to be taken into account. The detailed work plan clarifies and expands on the WP description in the DoW. The work plans are living documents that will be reviewed, elaborated and adjusted when necessary during the project's lifetime. They will be an fixed item on the agenda of the PMB and TMG meetings. Each work plan should address at least:

- the objectives;

- the technical approach (dividing the work to be performed in well identified tasks);

- the Deliverables (its exhaustive content lists, editors, reviewers, schedules);

- an appropriate effort allocation by participant / contributor / activity;

- the management method and supporting tools that the WPL plans to use.

In Annex I the PM resources have been allocated to each WP. If a more detailed task breakdown in the work plan reveals a mismatch between at one side the described scope of the WP or the Deliverables to be submitted and at the other side a partner's PM allocated, they should raise this

with the WPL and the WPL in turn with the PMB. In doing this the partner and the WPL should indicate the nature of the problem and support the identification of the corrective measures.

The Technical Management Group

The TMG comprises

- the CO (PACKED vzw);

- the technical partners (NTUA, UBITECH and IBBT);

- two content partners with considerable expertise in digitising artworks (MRBAB, NIMk).

They act as coordinators, supervisors, quality controllers, consultants and providers of technical know-how. They are responsible for the main technical performance monitoring and are the quality assurance body. If they anticipates a risk, a low quality performance or a lack of adherence to quality requirements or procedures, they will notify the TMG and PMB accordingly.

Steering group

The steering group is an external advising group. The members are experts in the relevant fields (metadata, contemporary art and digitisation). Their task is to give general recommendations on the project, to review the realisation of the project and the key Deliverables before their dissemination:

- D3.1. Metadata implementation guidelines for digitised contemporary artworks;

- D3.2. Recommendation on contextualisation and interlinking digitised contemporary artworks;

- D4.1. Digitisation workflow description for digitising the selected artworks;

- D4.2. Guidelines for an A-Z digitisation workflow for contemporary art works;

- D5.2. Ingestion guidelines and tutorials for data mapping and aggregation;

- D5.3. Enrichment module and Proof-Of-Concept;

- D6.1. Guidelines for a long time preservation strategy for digital reproductions and metadata;

- D6.2. Best practices for a digital storage infrastructure.

5. Technical Quality Evaluation

From the technical point of view, the DCA project will produce three main results:

- the digitisation of the items listed in Annex I;

- the preparation for aggregation (including metadata enrichment);

- the harvesting for and Ingestion into Europeana.

These results will be produced within the scope of WP3, WP4 and WP5. Each of them will be evaluated by a set of defined quality criteria that contains:

- the chosen presentation format;

- the selected metadata scheme and the set of metadata to be delivered;

- the taken interoperability measures;

- the long-term preservation policy;

- the usability (scope of IPR clearance)

This set of quality criteria is still preliminary and may be changed if the TMG decides on using different criteria.

The TMG will assess the status and the digitisation plans of each individual content provider in view of these criteria. Written recommendations will be provided by the TMG and the individual WPLs to the respective partners. At the end of the project the progress and development will be assessed again.

Each one of these criteria will be rated using the range defined as:

0 – bad;

1 – poor;

2 – fair;

3 – good;

4 – excellent.

The results of such an evaluation will be grouped and categorised, and discussed by the TMG or individual WPLs with the respective content partner.

6. Progress Reports and Deliverables

The Progress Report and the Deliverables are the main tools for monitoring and quality control. The WPL are responsible for monitoring, controlling and ensuring the timely delivery of documents and other Deliverables for their WP as stated in Annex I. The CO and the internal (and in some cases external) peer reviewers will approve of the quality of the Deliverables. The peer reviewers may request the involvement of other experts (inside or outside the consortium) for the review. The CO will ensure the timely delivery of the reviewed documents to the PO and their publication on the project website, if it concerns a public Deliverable.

Deliverables:

Each WPL is responsible for producing the Deliverables for his WP. The WPLs will appoint the authors and peer reviewers subject to approval by the CO. The reviewer returns the document with comments and suggestions. The appropriately amended version is then submitted to the CO for final approval and publication on the internal online communication platform MyBBT after submission to the PO. If the Deliverable is a public Deliverable, it will also be proofread by a native English speaker and published on the DCA website. The WPL should schedule a minimum of two weeks for this procedure. The Deliverables and their deadlines for submission are listed in Annex I of the GA.

The reviewer(s) should evaluate

- the quality of the communication, the analysis of the key issues and the author's intentions;

- the accuracy and conciseness of the expression, length, argumentation structure;

- the compliance to the templates provided by the EC and the integrity of the information;

- the relevance compared to WP description in Annex I and the aims targeted.

Interim Progress Report:

Every four months in between the Periodic Progress Reports of M16 and M30, Interim Progress Reports will state the progress made compared to the work plan in Annex I of the GA. They report on the activities carried out. All WPLs submit a report regarding the performance and the achievements in relation to the objectives and work plan described in Annex I of the GA. They also explain and evaluate any deviation and propose appropriate corrective actions.

Every partner will submit a summary of his staff effort in PM deployed for the reporting period. They will link the PM to the WP activities. They will also submit reports on their dissemination activities.

The CO will report on all management related issues for the reporting period, including risk and indicator status and the impact of deviations that are not directly related to any WP and of those mentioned in the WP reports.

The CO will submit the Interim Progress Reports to the PO.

Periodic Progress Report:

The Periodic Progress Reports are similar to the interim reports, but include justifications and financial statements on resources used during the reporting period. Deviations from the indicative budget and PM calculations will need to be explained.

The Periodic Progress Reports also give an overview of the activities carried out by the consortium during that period. They report on the progress with regard to the objectives of the project, the indicators, milestones and Deliverables foreseen. Also a description of problems encountered and the corrective measures taken, are included.

7. Document Management

All documents produced within the DCA project have to follow the naming conventions described below. Documents meant for public dissemination have to be published on the project website, where possible as a PDF. Confidential documents and documents for non-public dissemination are to be made available on DCA's internal communication platform MyBBT (www.mybbt.be).

All documents need to be in formats commonly available. It is the author's responsibility to choose the appropriate format for their documents:

- text documents: MS Word 97/2000/XP (for Windows or Mac) or ODF text document;

- spread sheets: MS Excel 97/2000/XP (for Windows or Mac) or ODF work sheet;

- presentations: MS Power Point 97/2000/XP (for Windows or Mac) or ODF presentation;

- final versions and publishable versions: Adobe PDF.

All documents are to be produced in English. All document names have to start with "DCA".

7.1 Types of Documents

Deliverables:

Deliverables in written form as opposed to Deliverables as products, are documents giving a content-oriented or result-oriented report. The list of Deliverables, their dissemination level and submission deadlines are specified in Annex I of the GA.

The EC has provided templates for Deliverables that are to be used. These include a revision history. The Deliverables need to be peer-reviewed. The logos of DCA and ICT PSP need to be integrated.

Periodic Progress Reports and Financial Statements:

The EC has provided templates for the Periodic Progress Reports and the Financial Statements in M16 and M30. These templates have to be used for the reporting. The Periodic Progress Reports includes an Excel template for the use of resources. The logos of DCA and ICT PSP need to be integrated.

Interim Progress Reports:

For the Interim Progress Reports a template based on the deliverable template and the Periodic Progress Report template has been created. It includes a PM status (cumulative). The Interim Progress Reports do not contain the resources overview and explanation of their use, nor do they contain financial statements. The logos of DCA and ICT PSP need to be integrated.

Internal Work or Discussion Papers:

In preparation of the Deliverables and as monitoring and working tools, different kinds of internal papers and documents are being created: questionnaires, assessments, files, concept papers, dissemination texts, website texts, schedules, plans, task breakdowns and many more. There are no templates available, nor formal guidelines other than using common formats (see above) or complying with the rules for naming.

Distributed Documents:

Some assessments documents and questionnaires need information from a number of partners, e.g. all content providers and their collections, or the TMG members. They are returned by each individual partner who is involved.

Meeting Documents:

Meetings entails different kinds of documents: an agenda, minutes, and in some cases an action list, a change request or a risk list. There are no templates or formal guidelines other than using common formats (see above) or complying with the rules for naming.

Project Presentation:

The template developed for PowerPoint presentations is to be used. It needs to be adapted to each event.

7.2 Conventions for naming documents

In order to ensure quick and effective identification of the documents and the different draft and review versions, a unique document identifier must reference each document.

The general rules for naming documents are:

- no dots, spaces and other diacritic signs in the name (e.g.: D7.2 -> D72);

- dates always in one without spaces, *yearmonthday*: 20110425, if a period of time then use a dash: 20110425-26;

- draft version: numbers change after important changes, only the author changes the draft version numbers;

- edition version: numbers change after minor changes, it is the responsibility of the author to draw up a new draft or edition version on the basis of the comments made by the reviewer;

- initials: to keep track of different reviews and comments, initials of author and/or reviewer are added to the draft-edition number, reviewers don't change the draft-edition but add their initials behind the reviewed draft-edition version;

- final version: here the initials and edition number disappear, instead the date of submission precedes the version number;

- distributed documents: in documents that are being sent to a number of participants with place holders such as <Number><NAME><Date>, the place holders need to be replaced by the respective information.

The respective document groups must follow the name building conventions described here:

Document type	Name Building	Remarks	Logo
Deliverable	DCA_<Deliverable Number>_<Short Name>_<Draft Version><Edition No>_<Author/Reviewer Initials> Example: DCA_D71_DisseminationPlan_V0ED01_KB	during the review	DCA / ICT
	DCA_<Deliverable Number>_<Short Name>_<Date>_<Draft Version> Example: DCA_D71_DisseminationPlan_20110331_V1	final version	DCA / ICT
Interim Report	DCA_<Deliverable	during the review	DCA / ICT

	Number>_<INTERREP01>_<Draft Version><Edition No>_<Author/Reviewer Initials>		
	Example: DCA_D121_ INTERREP01_V0ED01_CS		
	DCA_<Deliverable Number>_<INTERREP01>_<Date>_<Draft Version>	final version	DCA / ICT
	Example: DCA_D121_INTERREP01_20110429_V1		
Periodic Report	DCA_<Deliverable Number>_<PRREP-number>_<Draft Version><Edition No>_<Author/Reviewer Initials>	during the review	DCA / ICT
	Example: DCA_D131_PRREP01_V0ED01_RV		
	DCA_<Deliverable Number>_< PRREP-number>_<Date>_<Draft Version>	final version	DCA / ICT
	Example: DCA_D131_ PRREP01_20130430_V1		
Financial Report	DCA_<Deliverable Number>_<FINSTATnumber>_<Draft Version><Edition No>_<Author/Reviewer Initials>	during the review	DCA / ICT
	Example: DCA_D131_FINSTAT01_V0ED01_RV		
	DCA_<Deliverable Number>_<FINSTAT-number>_<Date>_<Draft Version>	final version	DCA / ICT
	Example: DCA_D131_FINSTAT01_20130430_V1		
Internal Doc	DCA_<WPnumber>_<ShortName>_<Draft Version><Edition No>_<Author/Reviewer Initials>	if necessary <date> can be added before the initials	---
	Example: DCA_WP2_Questionnaires_V01_20110210-BD		
Distributed Doc	DCA_<WPnumber><Partner number>_<Short Name Partner>_<Short Name Document>_<Version>_<Date>	if cross WP, then the short name might be sufficient	---
	Example: DCA_WP1_01_PACKED_Resources_V01_20110422		
Meeting Doc	DCA_<Group type>_<Doc type>_<Draft Version><Edition No>_<Author/Reviewer Initials>	type will mostly be agenda or minutes or participants list	DCA
	Examples:		
	DCA_TMG_Agenda_V01ED2-BD		
	DCA_Cons_Minutes_V02ED3-CS		
Presentation	DCA_PRES_<Event Short Name>_<Location>_<Date>_<Draft Version>_<Partner Short Name>		DCA / ICT
	DCA_PRES_IFFR_Rotterdam_20110130_Packed		

7.3   Document Repository on MyBBT

All relevant documents are stored on the internal online communication platform MyBBT that is accessible to all partners, but only with a personal password. Documents that are in progress and

that are dealt with internally by the TMG or PMB can be stored for reviewing and development in folders with restricted access to either the TMG or PMB.

Repository status on 24 April, 2011

8. Internal Communication Flow

There are three principal tools for internal communication:

- email and telephone;

- the internal online communication platform;

- group or one-to-one meetings.

Email & Telephone

For telephone communication a contact list with all details has been created.

For email communication, three different mailing lists have been created with the help of UBITECH:

- dca-tmg@ubitech.eu

- dca-pmb@ubitech.eu

- dca-all@ubitech.eu

MyBBT Platform

With the support and management of IBBT, an internal project platform (MyBBT) has been created for document repository, information exchange (blog, discussions), calendar (indicating meetings, deadlines etc.), contact information, FAQ sections etc. All partners have joined the online communication platform and have received password-protected access.

Meetings

There are different types of meetings:

− consortium meetings;

− meetings with the PO (Kick-Off meeting, reviews);

− PMB and TMG meetings;

− workshops dedicated to specific topics or the preparation of a Deliverable.

Indicative Meeting Plan

M01 – Jan '11	M02 – Feb '11	M03 – Mar '11	M04 – Apr '11	M05 – May '11
KO | PMB| Plenary (Bxl)		WG (work group) (Bxl/Amst)		Plenary | TMG | PMB (Athens)
M06 – Jun '11	M07 – Jul '11	M08 – Aug '11	M09 – Sep '11	M10 – Oct '11
			Plenary| TMG | PMB (Porto)	
M11 – Nov '11	M12 – Dec '11	M13 – Jan '12	M14 - Feb '12	M15 - Mar '12
WG | TMG			TMG | PMB	
M16 - Apr '12	M17 - May '12	M18 - Jun '12	M19 - Jul '12	M20 - Aug '12
Review | PMB		Plenary | TMG | PMB		
M21 - Sep '12	M22 - Oct '12	M23 - Nov '12	M24 - Dec '12	M25 - Jan '13

	Plenary | TMG | PMB		WG	
M26 - Feb '13	M27 - Mar '13	M28 - Apr '13	M29 - May '13	M30 - Jun '13
WG | TMG | PMB		WG	Plenary | TMG | PMB	Final Review + PMB

9. Risk Management

The risks foreseen in the context of the DCA project are described in the Annex I of the GA. A first draft of a risk register to support the risk assessment is also included in the Annex I.

9.1 Monitoring Risks

The risk register will regularly be updated by the CO and will be reviewed at every PMB meeting. The Project Risk Register identifies and categorises all potential strategic risks to the successful delivery of the project. For each risk area, mechanisms for risk mitigation are identified and, in the case of risks that are rated as highly likely to occur or as having a high impact on the successful delivery, a contingency action is proposed. Regular monitoring and updating of the risks are the responsibility of the CO. This means that:

the risk mitigation actions are included in project plans at the appropriate level and are monitored as part of the regular project management process;

- the risks are routinely monitored;

- the new risks are identified and added to the Risk Register as required;

- the contingency plans for any high likelihood/high impact risks are up-to-date.

The Risk Register will be available to all participants via the internal online communication platform MyBBT.

Monitoring performance is a key factor to quickly detect potential risks that are not related to failure of reporting or attending meetings, to discrepancies of planned and actual use of resources, to poor quality of Deliverables and reports, to lack of commitment in dissemination activities etc.

Therefore the following measures were undertaken in addition to the Deliverables, Progress Reports and Risk Register :

- each WPL has prepared a detailed schedule and task breakdown related to his WP and the expected input from other partners;

- in order to enable the TMG to monitor the digitisation process closely, the content providers developed detailed digitisation plans that describe which items will be digitised in which time frames, including all ensuing actions and targeted formats;

- an indicator list has been drawn and described in Annex I to be able to follow progress on another level than with the Deliverables and Progress Reports.

9.2 Identifying Risks

There are basically four types of risks:

- technical risks: a (technical) result that was targeted as outcome of the project is at risk of failing or showing poor quality;

- temporal risks: time schedules for implementation are not realistic or are being delayed and this creates failure risks to the execution of the tasks and the achievement of the intended results;

- financial risks: the budget is not realistic or is falling short to provide the necessary resources to achieve the results and/or the quality envisaged;

- legal risks: failure and risk of non-compliance with the GA and CA.

A risk can result from:

- a poor planning in the preparation of the project;

- a lack of commitment of one or more partners;

- unpredictable events, obstacles and drawbacks;

- wrong or poor decisions taken.

9.3 Evaluating Risks

There are three rating criteria given to a risk in the risk register: low, medium, or high. They indicate the likelihood and the impact of the consequences in case the risk manifests itself. A risk can be evaluated as

- low: it is either very unlikely to happen and/or would have in its event be of little impact for carrying out the project on a whole, remedies are within normal scope;

- medium: it is either likely and/or its event would entail problems on organisation, budget, and quality control level, remedies would take special action and perhaps external support;

- high: it is either very likely and/or its consequences would be damaging to the project, meaning either failure of meeting objectives, of complying to the terms of the GA or a significant mitigation of quality, this type of risk may have to be reported to the PO.

9.4   Risk Resolution

In every PMB meeting the risk register will be updated and reviewed. New risks can be notified by all members to either WPL and/or PMB and/or TMG and/or CO. The CO needs to be involved at every level ranging from medium to high. Low level risks within a WP can be handled by the WPL or the TMG.

The WPL will propose remedies for the risk. The PMB will decide on the actions taken. The CO will decide when to inform the PO. If the majority of the PMB votes for informing the PO against the CO, then this majority vote applies.

However, the first aim will be to remedy the situation with open processes to lower the risk level. The implementation of the remedy procedure must be closely monitored following a strict schedule involving frequent improvement evaluation.

10. Consortium Members

No.	Participant organisation name	Participant short name	Country	Project Manager	Email
1	PACKED vzw - Platform for the Archiving and Preservation of Audiovisual Arts	PACKED	BE	Rony Vissers	rony@packed.be
2	Interdisciplinary Institute for BroadBand Technology	IBBT	BE	Erik Mannens	erik.mannens@ugent.be
3	National Technical University of Athens	NTUA	GR	Stefanos Kollias	stefanos@cs.ntua.gr
4	National Gallery of Iceland	Listasafn	IS	Dagny Heiddal	dagny@listasafn.is
5	UBITECH	UBITECH	GR	Dimitrios Alexandrou	dalexandrou@ubitech.eu
6	Reykjavik Art Museum	RAM	IS	Bryndis Hjalmarsdottir	bryndis.erla.hjalmarsdottir@reykjavik.is
7	Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art	MMSU	HR	Jerica Ziherl	jerica.ziherl@mmsu.hr
8	Museum of Modern Art	MG	SI	Andreja Hribernik	andreja.hribernik@mg-lj.si
9	National Gallery - Alexandros Soutzos Museum	EPMAS	GR	Olga Mentzafou	olgamentzafou@nationalgallery.gr
10	argos – Centre for Art and Media	argos	BE	Frie Depraetere	frie@argosarts.org
11	Fundação Serralves	Serralves	PO	Cristina Passos	c.passos@serralves.pt
12	Netherlands Media Art Institute	NIMk	NL	Gaby Wijers	gaby@nimk.nl
13	Fundació Antoni Tàpies	FTAPIES	ES	Laurence Rassel	lrassel@ftapies.com
14	Ars Electronica Linz	AE	AT	Gerfried Stocker	gerfried.stocker@aec.at
15	Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium	MRBAB	BE	Pierre-Yves Desaive	pydesaive@fine-arts-museum.be
16	Staatliche Hochschule für Gestaltung (HfG) Karlsruhe	HfG	DE	Jürgen Enge	juergen.enge@hfg.edu

17	WRO Media Art Center Foundation	WRO	PL	Agnieszka Kubicka-Dzieduszycka	akade@wrocenter.pl
18	European Media Art Festival	EMAF	DE	Alfred Rotert	rotert@emaf.de
19	Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen	MBVB	NL	Nynke van der Wal	wal@boijmans.nl
20	Museum of Contemporary Art Grand-Hornu	MAC	BE	Jérôme André	jerome.andre@grand-hornu.be
21	Macedonian Museum of Contemporary Art	MMCA	GR	Maria Triantaphyllidou	maria@mmca.org.gr
22	Frissiras Museum	Frissiras	GR	Christina Sotiropoulou	info@frissirasmuseum.com
23	Latvian Centre for Contemporary Art	LCCA	LV	Elina Hermansone	hermansone@lcca.lv
24	MuZEE - Art Museum at the Coast	MuZEE	BE	Phillip Van den Bossche	phillip.vandenbossche@west-vlaanderen.be
25	Transmediale	TM	DE	Kristoffer Gansing	kg@transmediale.de