



Project no. 018340

Project acronym: EDIT

Project title: Toward the European Distributed Institute of Taxonomy

Instrument: Network of Excellence

Thematic Priority: Sub-Priority 1.1.6.3: "Global Change and Ecosystems"

C 3.1.2 Report on existing national consortia and other bi- and multilateral agreements between member institutions of EDIT

Due date of component: Month 19

Actual submission date: Month 23

Start date of project: 01/03/2006

Duration: 5 years

Organisation name of lead contractor for this component: NHN

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Framework and approach

Three out of six general objectives of EDIT refer directly to collaboration and integration: Reduction of fragmentation [obj. 1], progress towards a transnational entity by encouraging durable integration of the most important European taxonomic institutions [obj. 3], and promotion the undertaking of collaborative research [obj. 4] (EDIT, Description of Work, 2005). In project evaluations, institutional integration is regularly shown to be one of the priorities of the EC reviewers. Deliverable 3 of the 2nd JPA therefore focuses on a progress report on the current status of institutional integration. It includes a report on existing national consortia and other multilateral agreements to be delivered by WP 3.1.

WP 3.1 aims at designing a model of a new integrated infrastructure building upon the distributed collections facilities of the partner institutes. Several steps towards this final goal have already been taken, such as a survey on the applicability of the BRC concept on taxonomic research infrastructures (report D3.1.2, The concept of Biological Resource Centres: towards Taxonomic Collection Repositories, August 2007) and a questionnaire on the design of a realistic working model for a European Distributed Institute of Taxonomy (report D3.1.1, Questionnaire on the design of a realistic working model for EDIT, August 2007).

Complementary to defining, describing, comparing and selecting requirements and components of a possible integrated physical infrastructure, it is essential to identify the reality and level of present integration and joint research within EDIT.

Being part of international projects and initiatives, most EDIT member institutions are already linked in one or the other way. On an overall international level, the EU and its funding system provide a broad framework for integrated and cooperative network projects. As a NoE, EDIT itself is part of the 6th Framework Programme of the EU and so are e.g. MarBEF and Synthesys. EDIT builds on past and present European and national initiatives and projects, including, e.g., ENHSIN, BioCASE, ENBI, EuroCAT, Fauna Europaea, Euro+Med Plantbase, MarBEF, ALTER-NET and Synthesys, without replicating them. The same is true for other international initiatives like CBoL and GBIF. Most EDIT partners within the EU are members of CETAF and many, if not all are active within several of these international networks and programmes. They are mainly enabling joint research activities, but also linking and unifying infrastructure components (Synthesys NA). Legal backgrounds of these network activities are mainly formal agreements or consortia, which enable implementation and sustainability. On institutional and researchers' level countless bi- and multilateral projects and working groups link scientists and lead to cooperation on well-defined scientific problems. The basis of these activities comprises informal working groups as well as societies, where a membership is necessary to get full access, and joint research projects.

The gap between small-scaled collaboration on a personal level and large-scaled initiatives on an international level is to be filled by institutional cooperation. There is no general overview of such cooperation between European institutions available yet. A questionnaire was therefore used as an instrument to provide a quick overview over number and type of bi- and multilateral agreements and consortia currently established between member institutions of EDIT. Vertices of the questionnaire have been: legal framework, funding, partners, time scale, main goals, target groups, results. Finally, we also asked for very general overall assessment.

Box 1 Legal framework**Agreement**

A properly executed and legally binding contract embodied by writing or document.

Memorandum of Understanding – MoU

A legal document outlining the terms and details of an agreement between parties, including each party's requirements and responsibilities. The MoU is often the first stage in the formation of a formal contract. A MoU is far more formal than a handshake and is given weight in a court of law should one party fail to meet the obligations of the memorandum.

Consortium

A group of organizations that participate in a joint venture. Airbus Industry, a European airplane manufacturer, is a consortium of four public and private corporations in Britain, France, Spain, and Germany. An example in the realm of natural history museums is the

Results

17 EDIT member institutions replied to our inquiry. Their answers included another nine partners not providing information by themselves. There was nearly no overlap in agreements given by single institutions.

In total data on 17 currently ongoing agreements have been delivered. Although already completed another two agreements have been taken into account because of their complementary character. The number of agreements per institution ranges from zero to six, the number of partners involved in one agreement from 2 to 16 (Sp2000).

Cooperation is mainly consolidated by different kinds of formal agreements (12). Apart from that, four MoUs and two consortia (NL-TAF in the Netherlands and DNFS in Germany) have been listed. It should be noted here that all institutions participating in SYNTHESYS have defined national TAFs (taxonomic Facilities), but in the Netherlands this process had led to more intense collaboration than elsewhere, including formalisation through setting up a NL-TAF consortium.

In most cases (17), the agreements are focussed on single or a few clearly defined tasks, e.g. exchange of researchers (5) or technical staff (1), enabling administrative work (2) or publication of a journal (1). Five agreements are related to the development and maintenance of databases, the access and exchange of biodiversity data. Two agreements between the NNM, MNHN and RBINS were dedicated to the joint production of exhibitions. The RMCA and the RBINS created the Joint Experimental Molecular Unit (JEMU), an integrated lab facility financed as a joint project by the Belgian Science Policy Office. JEMU aims at supporting scientific exploitation of natural history collections in the fields of DNA barcoding.

As consortia, NL-TAF and DNFS (Deutsche Naturwissenschaftliche Forschungssammlungen, Sammlungsverbund) are multifunctional. The linkage between single institutions enables them to speak with one voice to stakeholders and policy makers concerning policy and funding proposals. Synergic effects are also used, e.g. for joint production of exhibitions, for research and training programmes and the promotion of young scientists.

Closely related to their main functions, target groups of the agreements considered here are researchers in natural history museums (often restricted to taxonomists, but also including those studying rocks, minerals and anthropology collections) and other scientists using natural history data. The Daubenton agreement focuses on collections managers, the NL-TAF and DNFS consortia also target stakeholders and policy makers. The NNM-MNHN-RBINS exhibition projects also included the general public.

Funding of all agreements mentioned here is provided by external and internal sources in equal shares. In five cases a mixed financing by internal and external sources is given. As external sources national organisations and ministries and the EU have been listed. No private organisations or industrial companies are involved yet in such agreements. The amount of money involved differs in a wide range from a few thousand up to several million Euros between the contracts and depends on contents, aims and duration.

In total three agreements can be considered as long-lasting (duration of more than 10 years): two Agreements of Scientific Cooperation between the CSIC and the PAN and RAS (arranged in 1973 and 1980, respectively) and the Flora Malesiana project between the NHN, RBGK, MNHN and UKBH-NHMD (arranged in 1991). Sp2000 was founded in 1996. However, main activities only started in 2003. And so are the majority of contracts of more recent dates (younger than 2000). Due to their linkage to EU projects (EDIT and Synthesys), two agreements by Belgian institutions on sharing staff and administrative tasks are limited in time. The same goes for two agreements by the NNM, MNHN and RBINS on the joint production of exhibitions. They were finished by the realisation of the exhibitions. However, the majority of agreements as well as the consortia are open ended.

Main results can be counted in staff members or scientists exchanged and books or journals published in a certain period. It is more difficult when processes are involved, e.g. in databases, consortia and other political agreements like the NCB agreement between the UVA, NNM and NHN, a policy document aimed at establishing a National Centre of Biodiversity in the Netherlands.

One of the last questions of this questionnaire was a rough overall assessment in four categories from 0 (no success) up to 3 (great success). With an average of 2.7 the result is very positive. 15 agreements are considered to be a great success and should be continued (top level 3). Another contract and both consortia have been evaluated as successful with option on improvement (level 2). Only the Flora Malesiana cooperation project was seen to be in a critical phase and may need to be modified and re-assessed.

Discussion

The response to the questionnaire showed an imbalanced distribution of contracts as only a few institutions reported most of the agreements. Reasons for this might be a really imbalanced distribution with a few but very active institutions, or a skewed sample through a different awareness of this kind of cooperation within the institutes. The questionnaire does not allow judging, but the results support the latter. They revealed two contrary facts: The

general overall assessment of agreements reported was very positive with 95 % of all agreements described as successful or very successful. On the other hand, the awareness of this kind of cooperation seems to be rather limited. That is shown by the small overlap of agreements reported and by the fact that several EDIT partners stated not to be involved in any of these projects though information was provided by their counterparts. A critical factor considering this might be the fact that most institutions seem to lack a centralised register of activities and agreements and thus respondents may not always have the overview of everything happening in their own backyard.

This questionnaire clearly revealed that bi- and multilateral agreements are very useful instruments in realizing projects, which could not be implemented by a single institution due to budget, time or personnel limitations. That should be seen as a stimulant for more cooperation on this level within the EDIT community and also with the outside world. The most important point in this process is probably the improvement of awareness of the advantages of such agreements within each institution.

Consortia as joint ventures of several organisations or institutions are complex and cumbersome. Results on two relatively young national consortia (NL-TAF, DNFS) participating in this questionnaire showed that cooperation and integration on this level need considerable time for development and maturation. However, in an overall evaluation both of them were already considered successful. Consortia are able to provide both flexibility and community and may be used as a stepping-stone towards an integrated infrastructure in a broad and long-term context.

Christiane Quaisser and Leo Kriegsman

NNM / Naturalis, Leiden, The Netherlands

quaisser@naturalis.nl

kriegsman@naturalis.nl

February 2008

Annex Details of agreements and consortia included in this survey

Institutions delivering the data are listed first in 'Institutions involved' (in bold letters).

No. 1 CSIC, Madrid 1	
Institutions involved	CSIC, SAS
Agreement	Collaborative project
Type of agreement	Agreement of Scientific Cooperation
Funding (type & resource)	Internal (each institution finances the travelling cost of their researchers and the accommodation of the visiting researchers)
Period	Started in 2001, reporting period 2008-2009
Main aims	- Exchange researchers within the framework of collaborative projects, - Support collaborative research projects between CSIC and the Slovak Academy of Sciences.
Target group(s)	Researchers
Main results	9 proposals, 6 approved (deadline June 2007)
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	M. Dolores Hernández, CSIC, d.Hernandez@orgc.csic.es

No. 2 CSIC, Madrid 2	
Institutions involved	CSIC, SAS
Agreement	Exchange of researchers
Type of agreement	Agreement of Scientific Cooperation
Funding (type & resource)	Internal
Period	Started in 2001, reporting periode 2008
Main aims	Develop research activity in centres of the Slovak Academy of Sciences Short stays (4 weeks) of researchers from the CSIC in centres of the Slovak Academy of Sciences
Target group(s)	Researchers
Main results	2 proposed, 2 approved (deadline October 2007)
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	M. Dolores Hernández, CSIC, d.Hernandez@orgc.csic.es

No. 3 CSIC, Madrid 3	
Institutions involved	CSIC, PAN
Agreement	Collaborative projects
Type of agreement	Agreement of Scientific Cooperation
Funding (type & resource)	Internal (each institution finances the travelling cost of their researchers and the accommodation of the visiting researchers)
Period	Started in 1973, renewed 2002, reporting period 2007-2008
Main aims	- Support collaborative research projects between CSIC and the Polish Academy of Sciences (emphasis in new collaborative projects and new research teams), - Exchange researchers within the framework of collaborative projects.
Target group(s)	Researchers
Main results	15 proposals, 14 approved, 1 denied (deadline June 2006)
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Carmen Cabellos, CSIC, C.Cabellos@orgc.csic.es

No. 4 CSIC, Madrid 4	
Institutions involved	CSIC, PAN
Agreement	Exchange of researchers
Type of agreement	Agreement of Scientific Cooperation
Funding (type & resource)	Internal (each institution finances the travelling cost of their researchers and the accommodation of the visiting researchers)
Period	Started in 1973, renewed 2002, reporting period 2008
Main aims	- Develop research activity in centres of the Polish Academy of Sciences - Short stays (4 weeks maximum) of researchers from the CSIC in centres of the Polish Academy of Sciences (quota of maximum 25 weeks for all proposals).
Target group(s)	Researchers
Main results	5 proposed, 1 approved, 3 pending and 1 denied (deadline October 2007)
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Carmen Cabellos, CSIC, C.Cabellos@orgc.csic.es

No. 5 CSIC, Madrid 5	
Institutions involved	CSIC, RAS
Agreement	Exchange of researchers
Type of agreement	Agreement of Scientific Cooperation
Funding (type & resource)	Internal
Period	Started in 1980, renewed 2002, reporting period 2008
Main aims	- Develop research activity in centres of the Russian Academy of Sciences - Short stays (10 days minimum) of researchers from the CSIC in centres of the Russian Academy of Sciences (quota of maximum 80 weeks for all proposals)
Target group(s)	Researchers
Main results	3 proposals pending evaluation (deadline November 2007)
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	M. Dolores Hernández, CSIC, d.Hernandez@orgc.csic.es

No. 6 NHN, Leiden	
Institutions involved	NHN, RBGK, MNHN, UKBH-NHMD
Agreement	Flora Malesiana, Flora of Thailand, SEABCIN, CD Rom series Orchids of SE Asia
Type of agreement	MoU, signed in 1991 with many other partners
Funding (type & resource)	Mostly internal; some external funding
Period	Since 1991
Main aims	Exchange information Link data bases Speed up production of flora treatments
Target group(s)	Systematists Data base managers
Main results	Contributions to the various flora projects
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	1/2
Contact person	Marco C. Roos, NHN, roos@nhn.leidenuniv.nl

No. 7 NNM, Leiden 1	
Institutions involved	NNM, UVA, NHN
Agreement	Agreement on road map for merger of collections and staff of NHN, Zoological Museum of UVA and NNM.
Type of agreement	Formal Agreement
Funding (type & resource)	Internal and external: from Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and the Dutch Science Organisation (“NWO”)
Period	Open ended, started in 2007
Main aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Articulating a policy for the new institution. - Obtaining funding for merger and new building. - Preparing the transition of personnel, collections and facilities. - Obtaining funding for updated and expanded scientific equipment. - Forging strategic links with relevant Research and Educational institutions.
Target group(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Education, Culture and Science - Board of Governors/Supervisory Boards of the universities involved and NNM Naturalis - Staff and labour unions - Other stakeholders
Main results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feasibility report has been produced and accepted. - General vision and policy for the new institute has been formulated. - Transition plan has been designed and accepted. - Decision of funding is still awaited.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	2 (the Agreement will be updated in February 2008)
Contact person	Jan-Willem Mantel, NNM, mantel@naturalis.nnm.nl

No. 8 NNM, Leiden 2	
Institutions involved	NNM, UVA, NHN, CBS
Agreement	Dutch consortium of Taxonomic Facilities, NL-TAF
Type of agreement	Agreement
Funding (type & resource)	Contributions by the partner institutions, predominantly in the form of person weeks. No external funding
Period	Open ended, started in 2005
Main aims	1. Policy co-ordination with respect to: - Collection, research and data management - Participation in FP and large scale national projects 2. Up to 1 January, 2007: cooperation in trying to bring about a merger of the collections and staff of EDIT participants UVA, NHN and NNM
Target group(s)	- The institutions bound by the agreement. - Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science - Consortium Leaders of FP and similar projects
Main results	No measures of effectiveness were defined, but intuitively it is clear that co-ordination does occur.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	2
Contact person	Jan-Willem Mantel, NNM, mantel@naturalis.nnm.nl

No. 9 & 10 NNM Leiden 3	
Institutions involved	NNM, MNHN, RBINS
Agreement	Agreements on joint production of exhibitions
Type of agreement	2 Multi-lateral agreements (some other participants were no EDIT participants)
Funding (type & resource)	Internal and external: project grant from Dutch Ministry of External Affairs
Period	2001-2003 (1 st agreement), 2005-2006 (2 nd agreement)
Main aims	Building and exploiting exhibitions on communication in the animal world and on life in extreme environments
Target group(s)	- General museum public - Exhibition Development and Production teams of the participating museums
Main results	- Exhibitions were successfully staged.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Peter Zuure, NNM, zuure@naturalis.nl

No. 11 NHM, London	
Institutions involved	NHM, MNHN
Agreement	Project Daubenton
Type of agreement	Informal agreement to exchange staff for training/development purposes
Funding (type & resource)	Internal. Each institution pays travel and subsistence etc for its staff whilst visiting other institution
Period	Open ended
Main aims	Exchange of experience in collections management, raising of awareness of other management structures, techniques etc.
Target group(s)	Collections managers staff – (usually degree level, experience in systematic work as well as collections management)
Main results	4 collections managers visited NHM, London to date. 2 to visit MNHN Paris in 2008. Ideas, techniques learned put into practice in the MNHN.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Dr Robert Huxley, NHM, rh@nhm.ac.uk

No. 12 Brussels 1	
Institutions involved	RMCA, NBGB
Agreement	Sharing EDIT staff
Type of agreement	MoU
Funding (type & resource)	External, EU
Period	EDIT (2006-2011)
Main aims	To share one staff member to fulfil WP8 tasks mainly and some WP7 tasks
Target group(s)	Not open
Main results	EDIT WP8 & WP7 tasks fulfilled
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Patricia Mergen, RMCA, patricia.mergen@africamuseum.be,

No. 13 Brussels 2	
Institutions involved	RMCA, NBGB, RBINS
Agreement	Joint Synthesys administration
Type of agreement	Non-legally binding agreements (sort of MoUs)
Funding (type & resource)	External, EU, Synthesys, Access
Period	Synthesys (2004-2008)
Main aims	To share stuff for administrative tasks for SYNTHESYS (Access part; managing visitors)
Target group(s)	Not open
Main results	Synthesys tasks fulfilled
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Patricia Mergen, RMCA, patricia.mergen@africamuseum.be,

No. 14 Brussels 3	
Institutions involved	RMCA, RBINS, NBGB
Agreement	Abc Taxa
Type of agreement	Part of a framework agreement between the RBINS and the Belgian Development Cooperation
Funding (type & resource)	External, Belgian Development Cooperation
Period	Open ended, starting in 2006
Main aims	- Publishing Abc Taxa, as a series of peer-reviewed manuals dedicated to capacity building in zoological and botanical taxonomy, in collection management and in good practices in taxonomic and curatorial research.
Target group(s)	- The series is open to contributions of experts worldwide with preference for contributions that are the direct result of Belgian capacity building initiatives, which adhere closely to the philosophy of the CBD, especially the GTI - Readers: taxonomists, curators, collection managers
Main results	First 2 volumes released in 2006
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Yves Samyn, RBINS, yves.samyn@naturalsciences

No. 15 Brussels 4	
Institutions involved	RMCA, RBINS
Agreement	Joint Experimental Molecular Unit (JEMU)
Type of agreement	Integrated research infrastructure, a contract signed between the institutions and the government.
Funding (type & resource)	External, Belgian Science Policy Office
Period	2007-2011
Main aims	<p>- Supporting scientific exploitation of natural history collections in the fields of DNA barcoding, phylogeny reconstruction and archiving biological specimens,</p> <p>- Developing, conducting and supporting research activities related to the experimental use, maintenance and scientific exploitation of the natural history collections of both institutes. Focus within initial phase:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Establishing a DNA barcode task force in response of the CBOL, 2) Starting up experimental research to evaluate and develop DNA protocols for archival specimens
Target group(s)	Molecular scientists
Main results	<p>Support of ongoing projects on molecular science, e.g.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Optimizing extraction techniques and focusing on particular taxonomic groups for DNA barcoding. Groups under study are <i>Crossarchus</i> (mongoose), <i>Afropavo congensis</i> (african peafowl) and Tephritid fruitflies, 2) Generating DNA barcodes from tephritid fruit flies for the Tephritid Barcoding Initiative (TBI), 3) DNA extraction of differently preserved Wolf spiders (Lycosidae)
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact persons	Floris Breman, RMCA, floris.breman@africamuseum.be; Zoltan T. Nagy, RBINS, zoltan-tamas.nagy@naturalsciences.be; Gontran Sonet, RBINS, gontran.sonet@naturalsciences.be ; Jeroen van Houdt, RMCA, jeroen.van.houdt@africamuseum.be

No. 16 SMEBD 1	
Institutions involved	SMEBD, UVA
Agreement	To host Fauna Europaea
Type of agreement	MoU between SMEBD and CETAF to confirm agreements between SMEBD and the FaEu experts
Funding (type & resource)	Internal, External, EU
Period	Open ended, starting in 2000
Main aims	Access to biodiversity data
Target group(s)	Taxonomists, data managers, ecologists, students, consultants, and environment managers
Main results	Fauna Europaea data play an increasing role (within Europe) as taxonomic meta data within a wide range of information systems. In most cases the Fauna Europaea data are not directly 'visible', but they are the hang-up (or backbone) to integrate and structure biodiversity / biological information.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Yde de Jong, UVA, yjong@science.uva.nl

No. 17 SMEBD 2	
Institutions involved	SMEBD, VLIZ
Agreement	To host European Register of Marine Species (ERMS, part of MarBEF data system)
Type of agreement	MoU
Funding (type & resource)	Internal, External, EU
Period	Open ended, starting in 2004
Main aims	Access to biodiversity data
Target group(s)	Marine taxonomists
Main results	- Maintenance of ERMS for at least 10 years, - Number of pages visited: in 2006: 389213, in 2007: 851621, - 25 organisations have requested and received a copy of ERMS, - More secure and higher quality data management that has provided a platform for greater contribution by the taxonomic and informatics community to the development of the ERMS resource.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact person	Ward Appeltans, VLIZ, ward.appeltans@vliz.be

No. 18 Sp2000	
Institutions involved	MNHN, CSIC, UVA, NNM, NHML, RBGK , RBINS, RMCA, MIZPAN, SMEBD, ZINRAS, MO, (Sp2000): - direct participation agreement (13 EDIT members). Also CBS (via Sp Fungorum), FUB-BGBM (via IOPI), & USNM (via ITIS) - indirect agreement via projects (3 EDIT members). Total 16 EDIT members.
Agreement	Species 2000 Catalogue of Life programme.
Type of agreement	i) Species 2000 membership agreement, and/or ii) Species 2000 data access agreement.
Funding (type & resource)	Multiple ongoing funds from external sources – e.g. 2.45 M € (EuroCat), ENBI, CBOL, Royal Society, BBSRC, IUBS, CODATA, Univ. Reading, EoL, multiple grants from GBIF.
Period	Open ended, started 1996, main activity from 2003
Main aims	Deep integration of taxonomic database content to create a public use taxonomic backbone called the Catalogue of Life. Composed of an integrated taxonomic hierarchy and an integrated synonymic species checklist. See www.catalogueoflife.org & www.sp2000.org
Target group(s)	<i>Target participants:</i> Senior monographic taxonomists and their database assistants. <i>Target users:</i> National and international biodiversity portals world-wide – eg GBIF, CBD, EoL, CBOL etc.
Main results	- Unique and successful creation of the <i>Catalogue of Life</i> reaching One Million Species in 2007, and 1.1 million in 2008. - 29 Mar 2007: celebrated <i>One Million Species Day</i> symposium supported by the EC DG Research.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	3
Contact persons	Dr Thierry Bourgoïn, MNHN, bourgoïn@mnhn.fr Prof. Frank A. Bisby, Sp2000 Reading, f.a.bisby@rdg.ac.uk

No. 19 DNFS	
Institutions involved	3 EDIT members: MFN, FUB-BGBM, SMNS (in total 11 German museums of natural history)
Agreement	Deutsche Naturwissenschaftliche Forschungssammlungen, Sammlungsverbund (DNFS)
Type of agreement	Consortium, Agreement
Funding (type & resource)	Internal
Period	Open ended, started in 2007
Main aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of a national profile of German scientific collections of natural history. - Coordination of research linked to the system earth-life (geo- & biosphere) in German scientific collections of natural history. - Joint proposals for funding on national and international level. - Development of a common policy on collection management. - Development of a common digital information and documentation system. - Joint training of young scientists and technical staff. - Representative of the German scientific collections and counterpart for decision makers, public, media. - Joint concept of educational activities (exhibitions, school projects, public awareness).
Target group(s)	Stakeholders, policymakers, public
Main results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National counterpart for policy makers, e.g. for CBD-COP 9, representation of Germany in the OECD-GSF-forum on importance of scientific collections of natural history. - Participation in LifeLongLearning. - Improved research cooperation, media presence. - In preparation: first joint production of exhibition, joint proposal of EU projects, development of a common strategy.
General overall assessment: 0 – No success, to be stopped 1 – Chances, to be modified 2 – Success, to be improved 3 – Great success	2
Contact person	Prof. Reinhold Leinfelder, MFN, leinfelder@dnfs.de