



Grant Agreement No. 687676

Innovation Action

ICT-20-2015

D1.2 Interim Progress and Financial Reports

Due date	Month 6
Actual date	Month 8
Deliverable author(s)	Jayne Beaufoy
Partner(s)	COVUNI
Version	V1
Status	Final
Dissemination level	Public

Project Coordinator

Coventry University

Sylvester Arnab

Priory Street, Coventry CV15FB, UK

E-mail: s.arnab@coventry.ac.uk

Project website: <http://www.beaconing.eu>



Version control				
Version	Date	Author	Institution	Change and where applicable reason for change
V1	July	Jayne Beaufoy	COVUNI	Not Applicable
V2	August	Ioana Andreea Stefan (Stanescu)	ATS	Review of the document
V2_ist	August	Neil Judd	HFC	Review of the document

Quality control				
QA Version	Date	QA Responsible	Institution	Change and where applicable reason for change
V2_ist	16/8/2016	Jannicke Baalsrud Hauge	BIBA	Minor changes. Pre check for release approval.

Release approval				
Version	Date	Name	Institution	Role
V3	19/08/2016	Jannicke Baalsrud Hauge	BIBA	QM

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This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise.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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT OBJECTIVES	5
1 WORK PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS DURING THE PERIOD.....	9
1.1 WORK PACKAGE 1.....	9
1.1.1 Consortium management tasks and achievements.....	9
1.1.2 Cooperation with other projects	11
1.1.3 Problems which have occurred and how they were solved or envisaged solutions	11
1.1.4 Changes in the consortium (if any).....	11
1.1.5 List of project meetings, dates and venues.....	11
1.1.6 Project planning and status.....	12
1.1.7 Impact of possible deviations from the planned milestones and deliverables (if any)	13
1.1.8 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	13
1.1.9 A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1	14
1.2 WORK PACKAGE 2.....	14
1.2.1 Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task.....	14
1.2.2 Significant results	15
1.2.3 Reasons for deviations from Annex 1 and their impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning.....	15
1.2.4 Reasons for failing to achieve critical objectives and/or not being on schedule and explain the impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning	16
1.2.5 A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1	16
1.2.6 If applicable, propose corrective actions.....	16
1.3 WORK PACKAGE 3.....	16
1.3.1 Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task.....	16
1.3.2 Significant results	18
1.3.3 Reasons for deviations from Annex 1 and their impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning.....	18
1.3.4 Reasons for failing to achieve critical objectives and/or not being on schedule and explain the impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning	18
1.3.5 A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1	19
1.3.6 If applicable, propose corrective actions.....	19
1.4 WORK PACKAGES 4, 5, 6 AND 7.....	19
1.4.1 Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task.....	19

1.4.2 *Significant results* 19

1.4.3 *Reasons for deviations from Annex 1 and their impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning*..... 19

1.4.4 *Reasons for failing to achieve critical objectives and/or not being on schedule and explain the impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning* 20

1.4.5 *A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1* 20

1.4.6 *If applicable, propose corrective actions*..... 20

EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISIONS..... **21**

CONCLUSION..... **22**

APPENDIX: DEFINITIONS OF TERMS..... **23**

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1: WP1 overall PM allocation and Usage at M6 per partner 14

Table 2: WP2 overall PM allocation and Usage at M6 per partner 16

Table 3: WP 3 overall PM allocation and Usage at M6 per partner 19

Table 4: WP4, 5, 6 and 7 overall PM allocation per partner 20

Table 5: List of abbreviations 23

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

An overview of the project objectives for the reporting period in question, as included in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement.

Work Package 1: Project Management

Duration: Month 1-36

WPL: COVUNI

The primary objective of this WP is to ensure coordination, cooperation and cohesion in all aspects of the project's lifetime ensuring that all foreseen activities are carried out accordingly with the approved work plan.

- Ensure the project's quality standards and schedule for Deliverables;
- Act as an interface to the European Commission;
- Execute decisions taken by the Project Steering Committee or General Assembly;
- Manage the financial and administrative aspects requesting financial activity progress information from the partners, monitoring the project progress and activities against the work-plan and compiling official reports for the European Commission services;
- Favour a proactive and collaborative approach among all partners mediating administrative or contractual issues and by reporting to executive committee where inability to resolve issues occurs;
- Ensure smooth communications among the partners and with external entities.

Work Package 2: Dissemination and Communication

Duration: Month 1-36

WPL: UCM

The main objective of this WP is to increase the visibility of the project and to ensure that the outcomes of the project have a significant impact across Europe. In the medium and long term, the aim of this WP is to create and nurture the core of an ecosystem that will guarantee sustainability and adoption of project results in real contexts. The target audience will be as broad as possible, with a focus on both academia and industry.

Through the activities in this WP we aim to communicate and potentiate BEACONING's impact, seeking that both research partners and SMEs maximise a return on investment and a concrete commercial exploitation possibility. The idea behind exploitation activities is also to reinforce the serious games market in general and to make the activity of designing and selling serious games more advantageous for all involved stakeholders.

Finally this WP also aims to disseminate across Europe the impact that these achievements can have for European citizens, with special attention to how this affects the employability of our future workforce. This WP will also include technology watch to ensure exploitation and impact are optimised.

Activities include:

- Development of an active dissemination strategy for spreading project outcomes to the target stakeholders;

- Spreading knowledge and awareness around the potential of pervasive games through the project portal and mainstream social media, in order to build a solid understanding of the approaches and the solutions that are advanced within the project and increase the interested stakeholders and active actors in the market.

Work Package 3: Requirements, Design and Specification

Duration: Month 1-25

WLP: BIBA

This WP scopes the architectural specifications with respect to disability standards based on the analysis of the stakeholders and their requirements. Scoping will inform about where and how many accessible elements or features are required under present disability accessibility standards. A technical provisions exercise follows to establish the components, dimensionality or implementation and design details of the accessible elements. Both the low and high level architecture will be defined in this WP to ensure the integration and scalability of the different modules and the components that will make up the BEACONING infrastructure and its platform. This WP also covers the design of a framework for the Problem-Based Learning as means of mapping active learning activities and interventions to meaningful play and game mechanics capitalising on the Serious Games Mechanics mapping of HWU and COVUNI. Additionally, this WP specifies the technical architecture of the platform and its modules, as well as of the ecosystem. This WP will provide input into WP4 to aid the integration design and framework for the complete prototype. Furthermore, the requirements will be verified or revised in the small scale testing in order to ensure that we meet specifically the requirements of user groups with special needs. Consequently, the specification and the architecture will be updated before large scale testing takes place. The approach reflects the holistic and modular approach from learning specification (layer 1 and 2) through to games (layer 3) and technological (layer 4) specifications.

Work Package 4: Platform Development and Ecosystem Integration

Duration: Month 7-26

WLP: ATS

From WP3 specifications, WP4 is primarily to realise BEACONING Platform components (software and hardware) into an ecosystem of pervasive learning experiences driven by gamified and game-based lesson plans.

The specific objectives:

- Development of the core BEACONING Platform supporting services and communication framework with a focus on interoperability and governing industrial practices;
- Implementation of context-awareness providers that will supply location and sensory information;
- Development of a multi-platform game and graphics engine coupled with a reuse-driven assets library which will be employed for digital game integration;
- Development of a modular play-learn authoring tool with procedural content generation;
- Elaboration of procedural content generation guidelines to assist content reuse in

pervasive learning ecosystems;

- Development of a gamified user interface with social elements;
- Integration of a learning semantics and learning analytics system;
- Development of gamified and game-based lesson plans and assessment metrics.

The project adopts an agile industrial-strengthened approach to ensure timely development of a robust and high level performance platform. Based on an agile methodology, the development processes follow an iterative lifecycle (WP3-WP4-WP5-WP6) where developments are validated and evaluated in small-scale setup within WP3 (specification), in real-life scenarios within WP5 (testing) and pre-pilot in WP6. See diagram in Annex Part B - appendix D.

Work Package 5: Unit Testing and Small Scale Pilot

Duration: Month 12-28

WLP: ORT

This WP is part of the iterative process where the platform prototype will be single and integrated tested, to be evaluated in a small-scale test bed. The project will include some of the learners at the identified test beds for the large scale pilot in WP6. This will include an estimated 60 learners at ORT training centres (France) and around 10-20 learners from each of the other test beds (UK, RO, TUR, IT) as recruited and engaged in WP3.

The main objectives are to:

- Test the single components;
- Test the integrated platform;
- Execute the small scale pilots;
- Introduce recommendations for large scale testing based on small scale pilot results .

The outcomes of this WP will inform the iterative WP3-WP4 process and provide insights for large-scale pilot stage in WP6.

Work Package 6: Large Scale Pilot

Duration: Month 11-36

WLP: ORT

The large-scale pilots aim at validating BEACONING integrated solutions scalability in real-life educational contexts by addressing large user groups. In contrast to WP5 small scale pilots the largescale pilots will be designed top-down starting with the engagement of networks of schools through to educational NGO's. The target audience will be of significant size and involving large and heterogeneous groups of learners. Specific studies, also leveraging online surveys, will be deployed for performing network analysis with the objective of establishing the large scale pilot target participant groups addressing cross-cutting school topics as well as intra- / inter school relations. The pilots will primarily focus on engineering, and entrepreneurship, as well as on developing STEM and digital skills. The exact content will be defined in WP3 and developed in WP4. This top-down approach will ensure knowledge transfer from one community to another

as well as additional actors in the value chain. Large scale pilots will be deployed in 5 different countries: France, Israel (ORT), Greece (ORT-UTH), Turkey (SEBIT) and Romania (SIVECO - ATS) involving a total of 5000 users. This WP will be implemented using outcomes from WPs 3, 4 (needs, user models, and specs) and WP5 (small scale pilots). The partners will use the gathered information and feedback in order to fine-tune the technical specifications of the educational content/tool. The large pilots will inform upon how innovation can be made upon ICT and education to create fit-for-purpose digital technologies for learning. It should give us a view on how to remove obstacles for ubiquitous learning. It should also provide insights to the likelihood of uptake as a business and its adoption in WP7.

Work Package 7: Exploitation, Impact and Standards

Duration: Month 7-36

WPL: SEBIT

The main objective of this WP is to increase large-scale visibility and persistent impacts of project results at European and international level during the whole duration of the project and beyond. Exploitation in BEACONING is organised along the three major interest groups in e-Learning processes. Firstly, it focuses on the customers, i.e. the Schools, Vocational schools, educational NGOs, Network institutions of education and their learners that require and use learning facilities. Secondly, it strengthens relationships with content providers (Open up Education initiative, OER key actors, Edtechs), which offer training materials, content, mentoring, and consulting, to make the BEACONING process a promising business model. Finally, via the connection to existing e-Learning environments and especially to social networking sites and meeting places like Facebook, Xing, MeetUp and LinkedIn, social learning offered by BEACONING shall be at the fingertip of potentially interested people, companies, and organisations. Experience from the latter activity will also yield insights to standards in open learning, where BEACONING will actively contribute with experience, best practices, and exploitation and extension of standards.

1 WORK PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS DURING THE PERIOD

The project is built based upon seven work packages, with WP1 Project Management and WP2 Dissemination and Communication running throughout the projects lifetime. During the 36-month period, other work packages will complete and conclude, to enable others to build upon them, establish recommendations and leave a legacy of the BEACONING project.

The following sections will consider the WPs in turn although it is acknowledged that some WPs have not yet begun. The ones that have had activity on will be reported here and this will form the basis of the M18 report.

1.1 WORK PACKAGE 1

1.1.1 Consortium management tasks and achievements

The management of the consortium is led by COVUNI as Project Coordinator and Project Manager, together with Work Package Leaders.

Throughout the project negotiation phase and up to the kick-off meeting in January 2016 Sharon Cartwright supported Sylvester Arnab (Project Coordinator) to lead the project on behalf of COVUNI until Jayne Beaufoy commenced the role as Project Manager at the start of the project (January 2016).

COVUNI issued a draft Consortium Agreement to partners at the beginning of the project, outlining the project's constitution, roles and decision making framework. This was commented upon by partners and subsequently revised and was finally signed by all partners in month 3.

At the kick-off meeting all partners introduced themselves and their role within the project. Jannicke Baalsrud Hauge coordinated the initial allocation of deliverable peer review roles to partners following in collaboration with the Project Manager then developed a timetable detailing to partners dates of this process in relation to each deliverable. This was distributed to all partners.

The process agreed is as follows: the Project Manager contacts each reviewing partner ahead of the due date to remind them of their commitment she coordinates the start and end of the two-week review period (depending upon the progress of the author).

The reviewing partner uses the Deliverable Internal Review form to record their feedback, and to annotate the deliverable, if required. Once received, by the Project Manager the review is then forwarded onto the author(s). The Project Manager also reviews each deliverable and works with the author(s) to ensure that the deliverable is ready for submission.

All deliverables are written using the standard template to ensure a consistency of approach and appearance.

At the beginning of the project ATS worked with the Project Manager to create a contacts address book and project wide mailing list for communication between partners (consortium@beaconing.eu). By the end of month 1 a secure repository for project documentation was created.

(<https://research.coventry.ac.uk/sites/beaconing/SitePages/Home.aspx>).

Ahead of the kick-off meeting, a draft version of the project handbook and quality plan was circulated to partners. This was later enhanced by the Project Manager based upon project decisions and practices, and was reissued in early March 2016.

The handbook outlined the key elements of project management, including the quarterly reporting process for Work Package Leaders and partners. The paperwork is intended to be relatively simple but still detailed enough to capture all the information and to enable effective textual and financial reporting at the end of the reporting period.

- The Work Package Report Form, to be completed by WP Leaders with the support of Task Leaders, asks for a summary of progress, an update on each task, an assessment of risks and issues, comments on likelihood of meeting deliverable deadlines and a section of other comments.
- The Partner Finance/Activity Summary to be completed by all partners, asks for information on their activity in each work package, the time (in months) that they have spent on each work package, risks and issues and a table to record their spending, both within the quarter and also cumulatively.

Although there is the possibility of some overlap, having both the WP Leader and partners perspective provides a rounded picture of the activity and can capture information that is missed from the other report.

The Project Manager distributed the reporting paperwork to the consortium, and partners have taken time to familiarise with the paperwork, especially the industrial partners, who have been given leeway. Moving forward the Project Manager will be challenging statements and figures that are produced by partners and asking for justification.

It has been agreed at the Project Board that the partner/work package reporting will be taking place every four/six months rather than quarterly (depending on partner). It is anticipated that reporting will still be effective and at the same time ease the burden on partners and the project management team.

Minutes from the kick-off meeting in Coventry were produced by the Project Manager detailing the events of the meeting. The minutes were circulated and were ultimately considered accepted by the consortium.

In March 2016, project partners involved in work package 3 were invited to attend a workshop in Barcelona. The aim was to discuss how to structure the missions and activities including the technical, structural and ethical requirements that underpin them. By creating prescriptive scenarios and discussing them with actual teachers and tutors, the consortium will try and identify their constituent patterns, to break them down and extract the bits and pieces that will inform our general scenario design and go into the authoring tool. Involving practitioners in the design of the scenarios from the start, allows us to refine them, make them usable and useful, and keep them grounded in their actual necessities, yet always keeping the door open for flexibility and adaptability.

An Advisory Board has been appointed to the project, drawing upon a range of knowledge and expertise that will aid project development. Members are:

- Dr Thomas Cochrane
- Prof Marcus Specht
- Prof Carlos Vaz de Carvalho
- Dr Samir Garbaya

The project manager notified the consortium that the members had accepted their positions at the beginning of month 6.

In June 2016 all partners made their way to Porto for two and a half days. The first day was the General Assembly meeting where all active Work Package Leaders gave a presentation on their current progress and also discussed the upcoming Deliverables and Milestones for the project.

The following day and a half was dedicated to Work Package 3 with the aim of ensuring that all of the deliverables were on track, setting the scene for the Beaconing Meta-Game and Technical discussions for T3.5.

1.1.2 Cooperation with other projects

It is important for the project to cooperate with other projects and the European Commission. At the kick-off meeting, the Project Coordinator introduced a presentation from:

- EC Project Officer, Francesca Borrelli (Day 1 morning only)

The Project Coordinator will continue to speak at events of other projects to share the message of BEACONING.

Current options for project collaboration are:

RAGE	http://rageproject.eu
3d-Tune-In	http://3d-tune-in.eu
No-one-left-behind	http://no1leftbehind.eu
ProsocialLearn	http://prosociallearn.eu

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

In month 3 the Project Manager contacted SEBIT, the WP7 leader, as they had failed to attend the workshop in Barcelona. SEBIT indicated that they were having internal difficulties regarding staff being released for events. The Project Coordinator and Project Manager offered their support. After an online meeting SEBIT were issued with a warning to enable them to push management for release to events and meetings and were also able to allocate additional personnel to the project team.

1.1.4 Changes in the consortium (if any)

There have been no changes to the consortium during this reporting period.

1.1.5 List of project meetings, dates and venues

The project has held two formal Project Board meetings during the first six months of the project:

19-20 January 2016

Kick-off meeting

Disruptive Media Learning Lab, Coventry University, Frederick Lanchester Building, Gosford Street, Coventry, CV15DD

14-16 June 2016

General Assembly, Plenary and Specification workshop meeting

INESC TEC, Campus da FEUP, Rua Dr. Roberto Frias, Porto

Media Innovation Lab, Praca Coronel Pachecho, 15, Porto

The next meeting is scheduled for Madrid during January 2017.

For formal meetings, an agenda is issued to all partners a month before along with a PowerPoint template which is also available on the SharePoint repository.

Each Work Package Leader presents on the latest position of their work package, aided by partners, to provide an overview of achievements and proposed activities.

In addition, the majority of partners met for a work package meeting/workshop.

1 April 2016

WP3 discussions T3.1 and T3.2

Barcelona Activa Technology Park. Facility for technological and industrial companies.

Marie Curie, 8-14 08042 Barcelona

In addition, other meetings between partners have taken place.

26 February 2016, Ethics online meeting.

16 March 2016, T3.1 online meeting.

17 May 2016, T2.2 online meeting.

18 May 2016, T3.3 online meeting.

27 June 2016, T3.3 face-to-face meeting.

Since the Kick-off meeting in January, an online meeting has been held with the WPLs on the second Thursday of each month. These were chaired by the Project Manager and lasted for up to 30 minutes per work package.

Meeting dates were:

11 February 2016, 10 March 2016, 14 April 2016, 12 May 2016 and 9 June 2016.

This monthly meeting schedule is to be continued throughout the duration of the project.

1.1.6 Project planning and status

At large the project schedule is on track despite there being a few delays during the first six months of the project, all deliverables will be met and there is nothing, at this stage, that cannot be caught up to maintain the project schedule.

The project has more than half of its deliverables due during the first reporting period, as this is project management risk, these will be managed carefully.

Following the June meeting in Porto, the next face-to-face meeting of partners will take place in Madrid in January 2017 and take the structure of one-day project meeting followed by a day and a half plenary meeting and integration design workshop.

The Workshop planning is underway for WP4 to be held in late October/early November in either Brussels, Nantes or Madrid.

The Project Manager has also been speaking with the Project Officer at the European Commission regarding the Review meeting in month 18 which will take place in either Luxembourg or Brussels it is expected that the Project Coordinator and Work Package Leaders will attend this.

It is noted that as we are early on in the project it has not yet become apparent which partners do not use their time and budget allocation for certain tasks appropriately. This will be reviewed as we progress through the project to ensure that activity is maximised and that resources are not underutilised.

1.1.7 Impact of possible deviations from the planned milestones and deliverables (if any)

Despite efforts in delivering all deliverables on time the consortium acknowledges that there have been delays in the submission of D1.1, D1.7, D2.2 and D3.1 all delivered in PM8.

D2.1 was delivered early in PM 7. The delay in the submissions had several reasons: first of all, it took some time to include all the new employees into the project and get them aligned with the project objectives so that we could all develop a common view. The overall impact of this deviation is minor, but that is because some actions were for minimising any risks related to the delay in submission. For D1.1, D2.2 and D1.7, all content was in place on time and was distributed to the partners in advance, whereas the formal deliverable was delayed. For D3.1 this led to a longer phase used for developing the questionnaires for the requirements. In addition, for D3.1 several hundred questionnaires have been collected and analysed. Due to the fact that some of the respondents were younger (of an age that required consent from parents) and specific treatment of all collected data (according to the ethical and data management process implemented in the project). This led to much more manual work and higher processing time than expected. This deliverable delivers the requirements and therefore any delay would be critical for the project. In order to minimise these risks, a preliminary analysis of the collected data was presented and discussed during the meeting in Porto where all partners participated. In addition to this, the deliverable was completed during the summer break, for it to be ready when the partners returned from their holidays. These two factors have reduced the impact so that it can be considered as minor.

For the deliverable D1.2, collecting reporting from the different institutions and industrial partners is taking a considerable amount of time and this is delaying the process for the project manager considerably. However, due to the bi-weekly phone calls with the WPL, this delay in the project reports has a neglectable negative impact on the project work itself, and only minor on the communication with the EU Commission.

In order to reduce the likelihood of late deliveries in the future, more time (almost 6 weeks) is planned for the internal review process. It is therefore expected that the two next upcoming deliverables D3.2 (BIBA) and D3.3 (COVUNI) will be submitted by August, 31.

1.1.8 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

No partners involved in the project have changed their legal status during this period.

1.1.9 A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1

Partner	Person Months Allocation WP1	Person Months Used at M6
1 COVUNI	48	6.69
2 HWU	1	0.22
3 BIBA	10	1.507
4 INESC TEC	2	0.39
5 UCM	2	0
6 ORT	2	1.053
7 SUCCUBUS	1	0
8 ATS	2	0.02
9 IMA	1	0.34
10 GEOMOTION	1	0.5
11 IFINITY	1	0.19
12 PLAYSOFT	1	0
13 SEBIT	2	0
14 HFC	1	0.22
15 SIVECO	1	0.17
Total	76	11.3

Table 1: WP1 overall PM allocation and Usage at M6 per partner

1.2 WORK PACKAGE 2

1.2.1 Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task

Summary

BIBA

Involved in the dissemination activities and preparation of conference papers.

Organising a public BEACONING workshop for ICEC together with ATS.

Contributed to D2.1.

INESC TEC

Dissemination activity at Eurographics 2016

ORT

Partners delivered a presentation to target the schools in France and have also enrolled schools for the piloting phase of the project.

Materials have now been produced in French and have been presented to all ORT school representatives in France and Israel.

ATS

Coordination of T2.2 including the design and development of the project logo and project website.

The website has been launched.

The Visual Identity Guidelines (VIG) have been defined.

Participated at the International Scientific Conference “eLearning and Software for Education”.

Published a press release in Romanian.

The VIG have been finalised, communication and promotional materials have been created.

IMAGINARY SRL

Dissemination within the company and on the website blog.

GEOMOTION

Press release translation to Spanish and Catalan.

Design and implementation of a webpage dedicated to the project.

Publication of project information on social media channels.

IFINITY

Involved in the dissemination activities and meetings.

SEBIT

Press release published.

Links have been made with schools and early commitments made for future pilots.

HFC

Participated at the Assistive Technology Exhibition and Conference.

Participated at the Annual Conference (Association of Dyslexia Specialists in Higher Education).

SIVECO

Identifying opportunities for dissemination

Translating and publishing the press release

Tasks

T2.1 Dissemination and Communication Plan (Lead: UCM)

T2.2 Project Branding and Online Presence (Lead: ATS)

1.2.2 Significant results

The dissemination and communication plan has been completed, all partners are actively promoting the project with a growing presence on twitter. The website is complete with a public and private section and it is also available in nine languages.

1.2.3 Reasons for deviations from Annex 1 and their impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning

Not Applicable

1.2.4 Reasons for failing to achieve critical objectives and/or not being on schedule and explain the impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning

Not Applicable

1.2.5 A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1

Partner	Person Months Allocation WP2	Person Months Used at M6
1 COVUNI	14	0.91
2 HWU	6	0
3 BIBA	8	0.26
4 INESC TEC	4	0.2
5 UCM	16	0
6 ORT	12	1.143
7 SUCCUBUS	2	0
8 ATS	11	7.02
9 IMA	4	0.08
10 GEOMOTION	2	1.2
11 IFINITY	4	0.59
12 PLAYSOFT	2	0
13 SEBIT	6	1.75
14 HFC	6	0.08
15 SIVECO	10	0.97
Total	107	14.203

Table 2: WP2 overall PM allocation and Usage at M6 per partner

1.2.6 If applicable, propose corrective actions

Not Applicable

1.3 WORK PACKAGE 3

1.3.1 Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task

Summary

HWU

T3.1 objective to create a small focus group in HWU comprising of software/hardware engineers, interface developers and end-users.

Questionnaire has been sent out with a return due in September 2016.

Developed a generic technology taxonomy for cyber-physical system integration with hardware and software components.

T3.3 objective to formulate an experimental prototype BEACONING system, lesson plan and studio cell for vocational education covering a STEM subject base.

Attended the working group in June to discuss the pedagogical mechanism and the play learn design.

BIBA

Currently working on establishing the user requirements and the inventory. Contributing to the lessons plans.

T3.1 and T3.2 have developed questionnaires both for the inventory as well as for the stakeholders' requirements. These were sent to partners who have been actively collecting requirements from schools, students and teachers.

Analysis has started and this will feed into D3.1 and D3.2.

INESC TEC

Working on the usability and accessibility reporting and guidelines for the website.

Looking at the infrastructure, architecture and systems specification for the authoring tool.

ORT

Participated to the user requirement tasks by gathering different perspectives from the pilots and produced a scenario.

Proposed the scenario was split according to the methodology, this will be complemented during a workshop in Paris on 19 July.

ATS

Contribution to the definition of the inventory.

T3.5 has been coordinated by ATS with work focusing on the definition of the BEACONING smart cloud-based learning platform.

IMAGINARY SRL

Preparation of high level game narratives.

Involvement in the editing of the authoring tool booklet and discussion with partners.

GEOMOTION

WP3 workshop organisation in Barcelona and coordination of the event.

T3.2 Internal validation of the questionnaire in the inventory.

T3.4 Creative process to create narratives for the gamification of the play-lesson plan.

SEBIT

T3.1 A list of end-user requirements has been prepared.

T3.4 Contributed to a sample play-learn plan.

T3.5 Compiled and delivered a contribution for the platform infrastructure inventory

HFC

T3.1 Worked collaboratively with HWU researching the stakeholder analysis with regards to the specific needs of assistive technology users.

T3.2 Comprehensive research into the current technologies and how they can be implemented into the BEACONING platform.

T3.3 Ensuring that the authoring template is in an accessible format.

T3.4 Developed mini game brainstorm ideas and currently waiting for results of some small scale testing.

T3.5 Discussion regarding the technical and pedagogical requirements with partners.

SIVECO

Contacting teachers to engage them with the project and identify the target group demands.

Inventory questionnaire for the partners.

Completing questionnaires on requirement analysis with schools.

Production of two learning path scenarios

Tasks

T3.1 Stakeholder Analysis and Mapping (Lead: BIBA)

T3.2 Analysis and Inventory of Existing Infrastructure and Engagement with Digital Technologies (games, mobile devices) (Lead: BIBA)

T3.3 Learning Design and Specification (Lead: COVUNI)

T3.4 User Experience (Lead: SUCCUBUS)

T3.5 Infrastructure, Architecture and Systems Specification (Lead: ATS)

1.3.2 Significant results

By the end of this reporting period, the main results are related to the requirements from all involved stakeholders as well as a more detailed overview of the pilot participants expectations and results. These are described in D3.1. However, two other preliminary results have also been produced. One of utmost importance is the established lessons plans including a framework, taxonomy and scenarios (D3.3) developed under the lead of COVUNI. These lessons plans are important for the first development of the different components that will be prototypical tested in the small scale pilots. A second pre-liminary results is the inventory of useful components and expertise within the consortium as well as from many of the pilot sites. This overview will ensure high re-use of existing components and thus reduce the time to market.

1.3.3 Reasons for deviations from Annex 1 and their impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning

See section 1.1.7

1.3.4 Reasons for failing to achieve critical objectives and/or not being on schedule and explain the impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning

Not Applicable

1.3.5 A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1

Partner	Person Months Allocation WP3	Person Months Used at M6
1 COVUNI	11	9.7
2 HWU	6	4.6
3 BIBA	12	4.987
4 INESC TEC	10	8.66
5 UCM	5	0
6 ORT	6	2.11
7 SUCCUBUS	10	0
8 ATS	8	1.01
9 IMA	6	0.55
10 GEOMOTION	8	5
11 IFINITY	4	0.22
12 PLAYSOFT	10	0
13 SEBIT	7	1.75
14 HFC	7	1.76
15 SIVECO	9	6.58
Total	119	46.927

Table 3: WP 3 overall PM allocation and Usage at M6 per partner

1.3.6 If applicable, propose corrective actions

Not Applicable

1.4 WORK PACKAGES 4, 5, 6 AND 7

1.4.1 Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task

Not applicable as not active

1.4.2 Significant results

Not applicable as not active

1.4.3 Reasons for deviations from Annex 1 and their impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning

Not applicable as not active

1.4.4 Reasons for failing to achieve critical objectives and/or not being on schedule and explain the impact on other tasks as well as on available resources and planning

Not applicable as not active

1.4.5 A statement on the use of resources, in particular highlighting and explaining deviations between actual and planned person-months per work package and per beneficiary in Annex 1

Partner	Person Months Allocation WP4	Person Months Allocation WP5	Person Months Allocation WP6	Person Months Allocation WP7
1 COVUNI	29	6	8	4
2 HWU	36	1	2	2
3 BIBA	6	4	6	4
4 INESC TEC	34	4	4	1
5 UCM	24	2	4	1
6 ORT	12	10	19	6
7 SUCCUBUS	30	2	4	2
8 ATS	38	6	6	4
9 IMA	31	2	4	2
10 GEOMOTION	32	1	2	2
11 IFINITY	26	2	4	2
12 PLAYSOFT	29	1	2	2
13 SEBIT	18	6	17	9
14 HFC	24	6	2	3
15 SIVECO	9	8	18	4
Total	378	61	102	48

Table 4: WP4, 5, 6 and 7 overall PM allocation per partner

1.4.6 If applicable, propose corrective actions

Not applicable as not active

EXECUTIVE BOARD DECISIONS

Following the kick-off meeting the consortium voted for the additional member of the Executive Board from the nominations that were made at the kick-off meeting, this was an online voting system and resulted in a joint result. As a result, the Executive Board made the decision that they would appoint both members (Laurent Auneau from SUCCUBUS, Pau Yanez from GEOMOTION) into a joint position. This was announced to the consortium and subsequently approved.

Members of the consortium were asked to suggest names for the Advisory Board members following the Kick-off meeting, 19 suggestions were received. The Executive Board members were then invited to vote in an online voting system. The top 5 were invited to join the project by the Project Coordinator with 4 taking up the position.

At the Executive Board meeting in Porto, June 2016, members were asked to suggest nominations of someone to join the Advisory Board with an industrial background.

CONCLUSION

During the first six months the BEACONING project has laid the foundations to enable it to meet its objectives. A genuine camaraderie has developed between the partners, enabling them to blend the wide range of skills and knowledge that exists within the BEACONING consortium.

At the end of the first six months, the BEACONING project has carried out all work due within the period and achieved its milestone objectives.

Tasks will continue to be monitored by the Project Coordinator and Project Manager. This will be especially important as the project enters a new phase with the start of WP4 and the platform development.

In order to ensure that all deliverables are submitted on due date, a new process scheme with more time for the review and feedback period has been established.

APPENDIX: DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

DoA	Description of Action
PM	Person Month
QM	Quality Manager
WPL	Work Package Leader
WP	Work Package
D	Deliverable
T	Task

Table 5: List of abbreviations