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Introduction

The aim of the Artellite project is to design and develop a centralised Best practice e-commerce platform for the arts, through which satellite websites can be provided to professional users such as artists, galleries and arts organisations.

Each website provides users with mechanics to establish their market position and level of service, and back end meta data to support the evolution of their aims and achievements within that target market. Artellite also provides best practice guidance for artists and galleries to effectively use social media to market their work.

The central platform hub is a big data repository for all data from all satellite sites and provides meta data metrics to NESTA, the AHRC & the Arts Council.

The design research that supported this development has included:

- Royal College of Art
- Design Museum
- Barbican
- V&A
- Institute of Contemporary Arts
- Saatchi Gallery
- The Strand Gallery
- Somerset House Trust
- BFI Gallery
- Art 14
- First Thursdays
- The Other Art Fair
- Own Art
- Creative Sector Services
- The Affordable Art Fair
- Be Smart About Art
- Cockpit Arts
- Jotta
- Association Of Women Art Dealers
Problem Definition

The mission of the Artellite project was to understand why certain elements of the Art World have still not taken on the opportunities to explore additional revenue streams offered by the internet and digital technologies. By looking at what is currently working and what is not, the aim has been to develop a platform that would allow existing art industry stakeholders of artists, galleries, arts organisations and buyers to co-exist successfully, as part of a digital engagement eco-system that would benefit the whole arts marketplace, whilst retaining their independent brand positioning.

Comparable industries such as Music and Fashion have embraced the internet and digital technologies, though also suffering huge impact upon the existing marketplace with the collapse of high street giants such as HMV and the rise of internet portals such as ASOS. The established Art World has been slow, if not resistant to change, and slow to recognise and take up the potential of the Internet as a viable and fundamental marketing and selling tool as the result of a long stated fear that ‘mechanical reproduction’ could irrevocably damage the value of artwork (Benjamin, 1936).

DegreeArt, the lead commercial partner on the project, has been running an online gallery to support internet art sales for 10 years, with enough sales to sustain the business and its 10 staff members. The company’s clients range from internet browsers as first time art buyers right up to older, art educated clients. DegreeArt has witnessed a marked transformation over the past 3 years in art ecommerce with a rapid explosion of newcomers offering marketplace style websites for listing, selling and buying art.

It is therefore the most exciting time for the art industry online yet, it is equally the most terrifying. Such newcomers, unsympathetic to the nuances of the art world, have had a detrimental effect upon the existing market, by threatening the very infrastructure that supports artists, galleries and buyers alike. Indeed, our research confirmed that artists and galleries are not participating in ecommerce with less than
20% in both surveys having ecommerce (the ability to sell artwork through their website) attached to their websites. The team set out therefore, to overcome two polarized aspects of the current arts marketplace; galleries and arts organisations rejecting any online presence whilst new online unregulated marketplaces concurrently offer exposure for artists direct to buyers. The Artellite project asked what relationships, practices and value chains in the established art world could be modeled and/or transformed successfully online?

DegreeArt as an organisation first became interested in researching this proposition as they became increasingly aware of the following facts:

- The prohibitive costs for artists, galleries and arts organisations in building and maintain an ecommerce website
- The damage an out of date website, inaccurate information and unsatisfactory customer service and fulfilment online can have on consumer and collector’s confidence in an artist, gallery or organisation
- The need for Best Practice to be offered to the art industry to retain the good from the offline industry and transfer this online with clear guidance on how to interact online with all involved
- The potential and actual damage that is being caused by marketplace tactics being overlaid directly to the Art Industry without an understanding of its very particular nuances

This project targeted four main audiences:

- Artists
- Galleries
- Arts Organisations
- Art Buyers and Browsers

Artists: DegreeArt.com works with over 500 artists at any one time and over the last 10 years, whilst it has become more and more common to find artists online and on social media we have continued to be struck by the following:

- Artists websites are rarely an up-to-date reflection of their current practice or their archive Clients and galleries are turned off by out of date material, frustrated by their inability to contact the artists, as numbers or emails have all so often changed, and sales are regularly jeopardised by incorrect pricing
- It is common place to find the same piece of artwork marketed on several different sites, often with different prices and to find work that has sold, still showing as available as there is no cross-communication between the various platforms. Our research revealed that whilst 88% of the artists surveyed used social media (Twitter and Facebook), only just over half use it to promote
themselves and less than a third of them used image sharing sites like Instagram and Pinterest. Only 53% of artists who use social media, use it to promote their artistic practice

• All too often they use social media for their personal lives but not their professional ones, failing to understand the connection

Galleries: During our research, we surveyed 191 commercial gallery websites. The galleries were all commercial galleries who also exhibit at Art Fairs. Only 34 (18%) of these were ecommerce. Only 18% of surveyed galleries were ecommerce. Our targeted, qualitative gallery research results discovered that 67% of participants believed that having a strong online presence would however improve their sales.

Buyers: Buyers now expect to be able to primarily search for, find but also, discover, follow and fundamentally purchase successfully from the artists, galleries and arts organisations they connect with. They expect us to be up to date with our technology. They demand good customer service and, whilst it is true that purchasing art is very different in certain respects from purchasing your weekly grocery shop, we as consumers still expect to be treated in the same way by the website owners we are purchasing from. Particularly DegreeArt believed, and had confirmed during the research that the following are vital for consumer confidence:

• Up-to-date and current content: Despite these artists often having new and exciting developments, their inability to keep their online presence current was a huge impedance to conversion.
• Ability to easily contact the Shop owner and receive a prompt response
• Full Ecommerce checkout including consumer security reassurance
• Ability to return items
• Reasonable delivery costs and fulfillment time frames

The Importance the wider arts sector: For the team, this was a vital aspect of the future potential of the Artellite project. The huge disparity between those doing the online well and those who are failing to make any impact is dramatic and leaves the industry open and vulnerable to attack from those who will seek to exploit this lack of presence.

Galleries are a vital element of the Art eco-system providing fundamental marketing and mentoring to an artist and advice and guidance about what to buy and sell when. As an arts organisation, DegreeArt has always felt it is important for artists to have access to a service which provides many of the business elements of their practice ensuring the artist has time to commit to creating their artwork.

This is a partnership arrangement and unlike many older artist/ gallery relationships, one we feel must be open and fair to ensure that each party is as happy with the service being provided.

DegreeArt believes that there are 5 main reasons why we avoid or fail as artists and
galleries in our ecommerce endeavours:

- The costs involved in designing, building and importantly maintaining a website
- A fear that that our screens will be too much of a barrier between us and a the actual tangible object - People need to see and feel my work
- Putting prices of artwork online - I don't want everyone seeing my prices?!
- Understanding of the role of the gallery - people bypassing the gallery system for short term gains that damage the long term for all
- That there are no rules or agreed best practice for galleries and artists to abide by so galleries avoid it and artists dabble without direction or guidance

The overall research proposition and idea being tested through this project was the ability for the team to build a platform, based on our research findings and DegreeArt's industry knowledge, that would provide a structure to house the lessons learnt and best practice guidelines providing an online presence for artists, galleries and arts organisations as well as enabling buyers to purchase, track and follow artists, galleries and AO they patronise. Notoriously bad at collaborating, the project sought to test the ability for a single hub to provide all users with independence whilst, through their participation in the community, benefit the whole through shared learning.

The team therefore sought to:

- Research the current state of play with potential competitors, artist communities, galleries and buyers. This included social media and competitor analysis
- Seek out existing and new solutions to issues facing users in the ecommerce system
- Build wireframes to incorporate all the learning
- Develop a prototype for testing on all user groups
- Create a set of adaptable template designs for each group of users
- Adapt, based on the research. and launch the Artellite with 5 artists, 1 gallery and 1 artist organisation
- Launched the Beta websites and best practice guides

Design Summary

The Artellite digital platform will be the definitive best practice e-commerce platform that emerging and established artists & arts organisations use to deepen their relationship with existing markets, and reach new audiences in a financially sustainable way.

Arts organisations here include, but are not limited to, commercial galleries, agents and retailers; publicly funded galleries, museums and facilitating bodies. The key aim of the platform is to provide a design precedent from which existing services, tools and practices, can be adopted and integrated, and capitalise
Artellite will preserve existing stakeholder interests and support the evolution of new relationships by providing free and low cost e-commerce sites to artists and a best practice commercial service to galleries and arts organisations. This will effectively be a three tiered build, with Organisations representing galleries who in turn represent artists and one of the main aims of the site will be to oxygenate these relationships by design. For example, mechanics to assist on the brand positioning of ones work or company within the marketplace will be available at every level, as will metrics on how ongoing performance meets those aims and matches commensurate service level options. Each individual, gallery or organisation ‘spin off’ site will also automatically report back to the Artellite hub, so that big data meta-metrics on the engagement eco-system and its role in the marketplace are available to the investors.

Additionally, the platform will be built in Drupal so as to be open source, which means the code is not only free to all users but adaptations can be developed and shared with the support of an online community. However, a low level of take up of the bare code skeleton is expected within this target user group, so the platform will also have a built in business model, where early adopters of the basic service level will receive a site free, incentivised incremental subscription services are then embedded at increasing levels of service to secure continued growth. This will ensure broad take up and avoid unnecessary blockages in the value chain, such as the need for competitive marketing in a crowded marketplace. In this way, the Artellite platform will become the definitive platform by good design and maximum volume of take up.

To achieve these aims, it is also imperative that the commercial interests of current stakeholders, such as arts journalists, curators, galleries and agents are protected, and their contribution to, and benefit from this development needs to also be secured by design.

**Background**

Degreearts.com are one of the oldest and most established online arts outlets in the marketplace. They have a wealth of experience of both artists, commercial arts organisations and galleries and extensive hands on experiences of where conversion fail. At present, much negotiation in and around sales is done manually and on a case by case ad hoc basis. This is clearly unsustainable as it is unscalable, and there is much evidence pointing to this being the weakest link in the current market.

Additionally, the MTM Report on “Digital audiences: Engagement with arts and culture online”, demonstrates that interaction with arts and cultural content in digital environments can be classified into five hierarchical categories: access, learn, experience, share and create:

- Access: discovering what’s on, filtering opportunities and planning attendance or participation
- Learn: acquiring new skills and knowledge (for example, finding out more about the life of an artist)
- Experience: experiencing the full creative or artistic work online
- Sharing: using the internet to share content, experiences and opinions
- Create: use of the internet to assist with the creative process itself.

This report demonstrates that the bulk of interaction with the arts online is finding information and planning participation, but posits that the higher levels of interaction require ‘increasingly sophisticated online skills and behaviour’.

It is proposed here, that increasing engagement with arts and culture online from the ‘Access’, through ‘Learn’, to ‘Experience’ & ‘Share can be engineered by means of core design mechanics.

It is also proposed here that incremental income streams for the artists themselves and existing key stakeholders, can be embedded into each level of access.

**Engineer The Marketplace**

The primary aim of the site is to increase sales of artwork. This can only be done in three ways:

- Expanding the types of art that can be bought
- Expanding the types of buyers who will buy that art
- Expanding the types of transaction that are available
This type of growth needs also to be sustainable, and Artellite will address all of these targets by design; Artellite will be a platform that generates an ‘engagement ecosystem’ with embedded ‘income stream generators’ supported by the e-commerce engine back end.

For example, Artellite must operate subtly at the Access level to consistently draw in new artists and new buyers by aiming for incremental conversions from browsing users overtime and on an ongoing basis. The hypothesis being that increased engagement will generate increased sales.

Secondly, Artellite must ensure this primary level of the ‘engagement eco-system’ acts as a seedbed from which established stakeholders can benefit, for example by recruiting more artists and/or buyers incrementally.

Thirdly, this is a very competitive arena and ‘competitor’ services must be integrated, and stage manage their relationship with the platform.

For example, the ‘h’ platform for graduating artists featured in Creative Review can be offered a boundaried but incentivised association with Artellite so the service also acts as a portal; the online print service could be charged per click through for their association at any level. These services will only be available at the accessible end of the market for artist who are not yet represented by a curator, agent or gallery, with a view of maintaining the value of current stakeholders marketshare.

In such a way, Artellite then creates a seedbed of engagement between new buyers and emerging artists, from which increasing engagement between artists and collectors, curators and galleries can be engineered, as their careers evolve.

**Sample Design Mechanics**

Initial core mechanics will focus upon relieving blockages in the current value chain such as:

- Uploading, downloading and purchasing
- Incentivisation of user groups

Uploading, downloading and purchasing:

A significant boundary to the take up of the service is the ease of which artists images can be uploaded. It is proposed that that it will be necessary to develop an Artellite ‘Upload App’ to support, guide and constrain artists reproducing,
contextualising and sharing images of their work

It is proposed that to properly support the service from end to end it will be necessary to develop a ‘Download App’ that incorporates projection technologies, in order to facilitate buyers proper engagement with the images and look at how they might appear in their homes.

It is furthermore suggested that ones Wish List could offer a 69p digital download for images you wish to collect or try out before you buy on any TV with an internet connection.

Many online arts transactions fail at the contracting stage as the negotiations are essentially heuristic, partially manual and time consuming. This experience seems to undermine the artists confidence and therefore the sale.

A simple design mechanism that demonstrates at the point of enquiry, the financial apportionment and a sample contract, for example, could sufficiently ‘nudge’ the transaction through to fulfilment. A sample contract could then be generated for reference.

**Incentivisation of user groups**:

Core established mechanics will be embedded within the system with the aim of incentivising user groups and engineering growth by consolidating familiar practices such as “Like” and “Follow” in order to drive

- curation folksonomies
• subscription services (eg ltd edition prints, sketchbook screen grabs and studio insight videos)
• kickstarter [https://www.kickstarter.com](https://www.kickstarter.com) artefacts
• traditional sales of low cost items such as sketches
• gallery representation

For example, by sharing who has bought what, any buyer, at any level of engagement can ostensibly share their collections with other collectors, curators, galleries and arts professionals which with increased engagement from these sectors acting as an incentivisation mechanic towards increasing art collectors.

Standard links to generic social media facilities such as Twitter and Pinterest will be available to this end, and a Best Practice Guide for establishing a social media presence will be downloadable for buyers, artists or their representatives to implement. This should be market specific, for example, the way an artist uses Pinterest should show their sources of inspiration or work of their peers etc.

An example of a design mechanic that would incentivise the artist user group would be a spider diagram that represents where an artist wishes to position themselves in the marketplace with the aim of assisting the artist to position their brand and adopt brand appropriate services. For example, there will be a top level transaction limit at the lower level, which could be raised dependent upon the prestige of the gallery the artist agrees to be represented by; certain lower levels of functionality may also be suspended by agreement in order to maintain the value chain in the existing arts market.

This could then be used:

• to define what Artellite services the artist should be making use of
• as a metric to measure the performance of the service against

![Artists Brand Positioning](image)
• to track the evolution of an artists actual and desired position in the marketplace over time

Such metrics would be available to users in orders to monitor their use of the platform and its performance but also to NESTA as part of a monthly Metrics report.

In this way, the Artellite Hub provides constant quantitative data on qualitative behaviours and enables artists, galleries and organisations alike the possibility of engineering their presence in the marketplace and impact upon it.

In addition, it provides the funding body with metrics on the overall arts market, the hubs role within it and the hubs impact upon its co-evolution.
User Testing – Artist On-Boarding

Introduction & background

The purpose of the research is to identify first impressions, strengths and weaknesses of the DegreeArt website user journeys and, with the findings, make recommendations for improvement to the website.

Study Method

Two participants were taken through two scenarios, to create an artists' account and upload artworks to the DegreeArt website. These are the on-boarding tasks to register as an artist with DegreeArt.

User testing took place at Look Mum No Hands coffee shop, in Bethnal Green, near to DegreeArt's head office.

Participants

This tranche of user testing focuses on artists': their user journeys, preferences and behaviour. This is one of the three identified user personas. DegreeArt sought two of their newly represented artists to volunteer. Upon agreed representation with DegreeArt, artists’ are required to set up an online account, capturing personal details and uploading a supply of artworks. The purpose of the user-testing experiment was to observe and record this process.

Scenarios

The scenarios were designed to be relevant to the site's user journeys.

The participants were taken through two task scenarios in the order shown. The entire test lasted approximately 1:15 hours. The tasks were as follows:

1. Join DegreeArt.com as an artists
2. After you join DegreeArt.com, explore the control panel and upload new work to your profile.
3. ...

Metrics

Standard experience and usability metrics were measured including: effectiveness, satisfaction and efficiency as qualitative and quantitative results.

Materials

Workstation

- Apple Macbook Pro with Chrome internet browser
- QuickVoice (voice recorder app) with iPad
- USB with artists’ image files

Documents

- Participant screening question sheet
Tasks

First impressions: the homepage

The site was believed to be “cluttered” but generally professional. Both artists were interested in the ‘Special Offers’ category but for contrasting reasons: P1 said people are intrinsically attracted to offers and P2 was attracted to the category imagery but was disappointed to see that it had no relation to the page content.

P2 recommended a revised typographical hierarchy to improve the layout and navigation.

Scenario 1: Sign as an artist

P1 incorrectly set-up a buyer’s account, the default account via ‘Register’ an account. The options are separate links in the head nav and different subsequent forms. This gave her restricted options in the control panel. The correct task flow is via ‘join us – artists’. This added nearly 10 minutes to P1’s time-on-task, along with increased dissatisfaction. This might instead be a ‘relationship option’ nested within one master form, for example.

Above: screen shot of the two on-boarding links, ‘Register’ and ‘Join us – artists’
Scenario 2: Upload artworks

The control panel was difficult to find and, in both cases, the participants were asked by the moderator to reread the task scenario to find a navigational “clue” in the question. P2 then described this category name as "the wrong terminology": an unintuitive affordance.

When the participants logged in to their account they were presented with a check list. All the listed items/activities had been completed. When the participants navigated to the ‘Return to main site’ they were redirected to a sister competition page. To return to DegreeArt they had to open a new window.

Above: This is the artists’ homepage. The 'Pay Now' is negatively misleading and the 'Return to Main Site' button redirects the user to the DegreeArt sister competition page

Above: this is what appears when the user ‘clicks on terms and conditions’
**Data log**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of errors</th>
<th># of assists</th>
<th>Deviation from the optimal path</th>
<th>Site bugs</th>
<th>T 1</th>
<th>T 2</th>
<th>T 1</th>
<th>T 2</th>
<th>T 1</th>
<th>T 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positive and negative comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive comments</th>
<th>Negative comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 1</td>
<td>T 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The signup could be linked to Facebook to make it quicker&quot; - this was suggested to improve the speed of inputting basic account information.</td>
<td>&quot;You add your artwork late in the process!&quot; - the user uploads their artwork last in the task flow. The participant thought it was more intuitive to do this first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I don't know how much my painting weights?&quot; - this is a compulsory field which could be improved with guidance on weight examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The general opinion of the task is that the process was "clunky and counter intuitive". They believed that the design could benefit from a revised typographical hierarchy to improve the clarity of the navigation and category queues. The site could be improved with more fluid page transitions and consistent templates.
Both participants' initial navigation of the homepage was image led. The task flow of the test scenarios might be improved with more imagery and iconography to signpost their navigation, which at present is predominantly text and form fields. A more visual layout might improve their time-on-task and satisfaction metrics.

The navigation could also be improved with intuitive naming and clear typographical hierarchy.

The on-boarding for buyers and artists is unclear. The links need to either be clearly distinguished or unified.

**Recommendations for improvement**

- Typographic hierarchy: the nav bar and links could be improved with clear typographic hierarchy – removing boxes and colour and clear differentiating the various levels of content.
- The user has restricted access to their profile page and how their assets/artworks are displayed. To improve users’ trust, create more visual control over the curation of their assets e.g. enable users to rearrange chronological order of artworks.
• Remove artwork background filters – these distract from the artworks. Create more white space to let the images breathe.
• On-boarding: create one master form where the user selects a ‘relationship’ to the brand/site i.e. buyer or artist, rather than two alternate forms.
Competitor Analysis

COMPETITOR ANALYSIS
Summary of the Best Features
Competitors

**Artspace**

**Culture Label**

**ART FINDER**

**Saatchi Online**

**amazon.com**

**New Blood Art**

**Easy Art**

**ART.CO.UK**

Art Space - Culture Label - Art Finder - Mutual Art
Saatchi Online - Amazon Art (US) - New Blood Art
Easy Art - Art.co.uk - Artsy
Some of the competitors work with only Galleries or Artists. Here is a table displaying each competitors and their users:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitors</th>
<th>Artists</th>
<th>Galleries</th>
<th>Art Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Space</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Label</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Finder</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Art</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saatchi Online</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Art</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Blood Art</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy Art</td>
<td>×*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art.co.uk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artsy</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Currently not accepting artists
To Register, most of the sites only requires name, email and password. Art Finder and Artsy asked for favourite artworks, artists and galleries. They make a profile of the user to make recommendations based in their choice. Both of them make a Step by Step Registration, making easy to answer the form.

Artsy does the same as Art Finder but they add a Price Range to know how much the user will spend. In addition they suggest the user posible answers while filling the form.
Art Finder Control Panel is one of the easiest to use, the menu is presented in with an intuitive design. It also shows how to optimize the store.

One of the best tools to Upload an Artwork is in Saatchi, easy and clean. Filling the form of an artwork is better, because the system suggests possible answers.
Looking at Artworks

Art Finder

For Art Finder, while looking for a painting it appears a message that other people is looking at the same artwork.

Artsy “View in Room”

To preview an artwork The whole website is converted into a “room”.

Artsy “View in Room”
In Art.co.uk the cart is displayed at the right top of the window, while scrolling down the cart sticks to the window and never disappears to the sight of the user.

A nice feature is to see what is inside the basket anytime like in Culture label manages to do it.
Check Out

Art.co.uk Frame Option

Art.co.uk has an option to frame the artwork it shows the image with the frame selected and the cost of it.

Art.co.uk Check Out and Shopping Cart

Art.co.uk will show your basket at all times in the process of checking out.

Saatchi Check Out

Check out should be easy and step by step like in Saatchi online.
## Benchmarking

### Competitor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gener al</th>
<th>Site Criteri a / Category 1 (poor) - 5 (excell ent)</th>
<th>Degre eArt</th>
<th>Artfin der</th>
<th>Art.sy</th>
<th>Cultur e Label</th>
<th>Art Space</th>
<th>Mutua l Art</th>
<th>Saatc hi</th>
<th>Amazo n</th>
<th>New Blood Art</th>
<th>Easy Art</th>
<th>Art.co.uk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usabilit y</td>
<td>3 5 4 2 4 2 4 2 4 4 4 5</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*Currentl y not accepting artists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findabilit y</td>
<td>4 5 4 3 4 3 4 1 5 5 5 5</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>Need to pay and wait for the applicati on</td>
<td>No need to wait</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>wait 7 days</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality/F eatures</td>
<td>4 5 4 2 4 3 5 3 4 4 4</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>Registration easy to use</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credabilit y/ Trust</td>
<td>5 5 5 4 5 4 5 5 4 4 5</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage ability</td>
<td>4 5 5 4 4 3 5 3 4 5 5 5</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artists</th>
<th>Categor y 1 (poor) - 5 (excell ent)</th>
<th>Degre eArt</th>
<th>Artfin der</th>
<th>Art.sy</th>
<th>Cultur e Label</th>
<th>Art Space</th>
<th>Mutua l Art</th>
<th>Saatc hi</th>
<th>Amazo n</th>
<th>New Blood Art</th>
<th>Easy Art</th>
<th>Art.co.uk - artrising. com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registra tion</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*Currentl y not accepting artists</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uploading content</td>
<td>need wait</td>
<td>need wait</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>Need to pay and wait for the applicati on</td>
<td>No need to wait</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>wait 7 days</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key functio nality 1</td>
<td>hard to complet e the form</td>
<td>allows to save an incompl ete form</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>step by step registrati on</td>
<td>Standard dis/tips for picture s</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>Registration easy to use</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key functio nality 2</td>
<td>no preview of image</td>
<td>preview of art image</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>preview of art image</td>
<td>Help Videos</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>There is no preview of image</td>
<td>*No apply</td>
<td>sales and traffic report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key functio nality 3</td>
<td>*Only work with galleries or art org.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Buyers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categor y 1 (poor) -</th>
<th>Degre eArt</th>
<th>Artfin der</th>
<th>Art.sy</th>
<th>Cultur e Label</th>
<th>Art Space</th>
<th>Mutua l Art</th>
<th>Saatc hi</th>
<th>Amazo n</th>
<th>New Blood Art</th>
<th>Easy Art</th>
<th>Art.co.uk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*only work with galleries or art org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key functionality 1</th>
<th>Payment options</th>
<th>Validate profile based on signature</th>
<th>Display to view the artwork in a room</th>
<th>Register easy with email or Facebook</th>
<th>Select a price range is easier</th>
<th>Offer Print of Original Artwork</th>
<th>Discounts</th>
<th>View the artwork framed</th>
<th>&quot;virtual&quot; room</th>
<th>“Find Similar” feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key functionality 2</td>
<td>Delivery calculators</td>
<td>Recommend based on your profile</td>
<td>Now they make recommendations based on preferences in artists, type of art, and price.</td>
<td>Two Prices Shown (framed or not framed)</td>
<td>Artist Performances seen by Premium Users</td>
<td>Categories for Browsing nice presented</td>
<td>Art View in room</td>
<td>Art View in room</td>
<td>Art Phsycometry (suggestions based on taste of user)</td>
<td>The Roulette of Artful (application that recommends you an artwork by chance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key functionality 3</td>
<td>Request viewing &amp; contact the artist</td>
<td>Advance and simple search (search by seller, artist or gallery)</td>
<td>Contact by email</td>
<td>Request info form</td>
<td>A lot of effort to upload work</td>
<td>Change Label of Painting</td>
<td>Color of Original Artwork</td>
<td>Discounts</td>
<td>Gift Vouchers</td>
<td>&quot;sale&quot; options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gallery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Artfinder</th>
<th>Art.sy</th>
<th>Culture Label</th>
<th>Art Space</th>
<th>Mutually</th>
<th>Saatchi</th>
<th>Amazon</th>
<th>New Blood</th>
<th>Easy Art</th>
<th>Art.co.uk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (poor)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (excellent)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>DegreedArt</td>
<td>Artfinder</td>
<td>Art.sy</td>
<td>CulturedLabel</td>
<td>ArtSpace</td>
<td>MutuaiArt</td>
<td>Saatchi</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>NewBloodArt</td>
<td>EasyArt</td>
<td>Art.co.uk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (poor)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (excellent)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registration**
- DegreedArt: our art galleries, museum shops, and independent stores.
- Artfinder: auctions houses and museum.
- Art.sy: partners.

**Browsing**
- DegreedArt: partners.
- Artfinder: auctions houses and museum.
- Art.sy: partners.

**Searching**
- DegreedArt: auction houses and museum.
- Artfinder: our art galleries, museum shops, and independent stores.
- Art.sy: partners.

**Key functionality 1**
- DegreedArt: send email.
- Artfinder: send email.
- Art.sy: send contact form for information.

**Key functionality 2**
- DegreedArt: send email.
- Artfinder: send email.
- Art.sy: send contact form for information.

**Key functionality 3**
- DegreedArt: send email.
- Artfinder: send email.
- Art.sy: send contact form for information.
Research
Identify What Users Need

Research Summary
User research was carried out at Art 14, Tate Modern and First Thursdays; Degree Art's represented artists participated in user testing their website's onboarding process and online questionnaire surveys were sent to Royal College of Art MA students, Kingston University Fine Art BA student, Kingston alumni Gallerists and a network of established curators.

The resulting data has been summarized below:

Domain Feedback
Buyers were asked to feedback on the ecommerce art website homepages: Degree Art, Saatchi Art, ByArt, Art Space and art Finder.

- Byart received low aesthetic regard but the (ecommerce) functionality was immediately clear.
- Saatchi Art was recognized and trusted but assumed to have an unaffordable price-point. Participants (incorrectly) believed its 'Artist or Collector' item was a content customization feature when it was actually a subscription data gathering form field – however, it was perceived to improve their experience.
- The layout and brand perception predetermined a perception of the websites' function, for example, Art Space was perceived to be a blog and not an ecommerce platform and Saatchi Art was assumed to serve-up information on the Saatchi Gallery.
- Users ignored navigational structure / categories. Their user journeys were led by imagery and content they were attracted to.
- Art Finder had the highest regard, for it's white space, clear purpose and trustworthy tone of voice. The user journey (and call to action) was immediately obvious via the central button 'shop for art', which gave users a "sense of control".

User Testing
Users were proficient with computers spending up to 6-8 hours daily online.

- They had a positive perception of the Degree Art brand – they believed it connected with artists, created positive exposure and selected high quality artworks.
- Each user had their own portfolio website, which one sold indirectly from.
- Users found navigation very difficult and felt that caused the two task errors and assists. The mean time-on-task for onboarding was 13 minutes and for uploading artworks, it was 24 minutes. Users suggested that increased visual signposting, and improved typographical hierarchy would improve the task efficiency and satisfaction.
- Users wanted more control over the front-end appearance of their profile, with access (via the control panel) to curate/edit the display of artworks and contextual information. It was said that this was improve their "trust".
- Users were confused by which account to set up and Participant 1 incorrectly set-up a buyers account instead of selecting 'Register' for an artists' account.
• It was suggested that ‘Control panel’ category pages might be renamed to a more intuitive name and affordance.

• Create more white space around the image content to allow the content to breathe (a site-wide comment) and with larger picture thumbnails.

Artists
The user group’s age range was from 18 – 64+ and computer competency was good to very good.

• 70% used laptops to go online – the only user group to show a distinct preference.

• Facebook was the favoured social network for art with an 85% majority. Twitter was second most used.

• 93% of users exhibited and sold artworks with an equal number of organizations /galleries offline as online.

• 92% had a personal website but 52% had ecommerce built in. 66% sold their artwork via Degree Art – feeling equipped and in control of fulfilling sales.

• 80% of users believed a gallery had a very important role in their sales

• The majority of artists felt it was important to have some background information about the buyers purchasing their work.

Galleries

• All galleries had a website, and primarily for promotion and PR but the significant majority did not include or intend to include ecommerce. The three galleries who valued and incorporated ecommerce had inventory at a lower price-point with less established artists. The inventory sold online was rarely original artworks and mostly event collateral (e.g. catalogues) and prints.

• Galleries used bespoke CMS, Wix and Wordpress. Most had minimal content control but 75% were satisfied with their website.

• Website updates were driven by exhibitions, new artworks and communications, which on average were necessitated daily to 6 times annually. Updates were mostly made in-house but no galleries had a designated role for this job and administered this on an ad-hoc basis by Gallery Assistants and one Gallery Director (The Vyner Studio).

• The smaller and younger galleries, with presumably smaller revenue streams, spent more on their website in comparison to older established brands, with presumably exponentially higher revenue streams

• Ecommerce was incorporated into 30% of sites. These were galleries with a low to medium price-point. 37% sold through 3rd party retailers such as Art Space and an Amazon API.

Buyers
Users had average to very competent computer skills. The buyers researched, collected artworks with a low to average price-point of £50 - £2,000 for generally more than 5 years.

• Facebook was the most common social network used to explore art, via peer to peer posts / recommendations
• Half had previously bought art online. Common barriers to online buying were that they preferred to “see art in the flesh”, “get a sense of scale” or hadn’t previously considered ecommerce art.

• Most preferred to purchase artwork directly from an artist than from a gallery.

• Purchases were sporadic and at most, made 6 times annually and the large majority collected for decoration. A purchase was usually influenced by a visit to a gallery or art fair.

Recommendations for improved ecommerce

Reduce online barrier

• If buyers were able to visualize art in their homes it would help to comprehend its scale and suitability. This might work like IKEA’s catalogue app, which renders 3D furniture into users homes via augmented reality.

• Provide a high quality, 360 degrees view of artwork, to allow buyers to inspect/scrutinize its detail (like ASOS’s product viewer).

• Allow artists access to edit and curate their inventory.

• Build account profiles for buyers (as well as artists and galleries) so the home and journey of an artwork is transparent to the artists when a sale is agreed/made.

• CMS designed to enable low-tech users (gallery staff) to administer updates

Layout

• Create a template with increased white space around the artworks with larger images (scale and quality)

• Design an aesthetic that clearly translates the website’s purpose

Navigation

• Content customization (like the misunderstood Saatchi website) for each user group

• Visual user journeys /navigation
ARTISTS

Main Points we need from the artist is their background information who are our main users and how they interact online.

In addition we need to know how their role within the art market. If they sell their work online or not.

For this target group the Questionnaire were divide by the information we needed Artist’s Background, Online Behaviour and Business.

ARTIST’S BACKGROUND

In total there 10 people answer the questionnaires
The average age was between 25 to 35 years. Most of them Full-Time Artist, graduated from an Art discipline.
Painting is the art that is produced the most.
Participants exhibits between 0-5 pieces both online and offline

ONLINE BEHAVIOUR

60% considered themselves Good and 40% Very Good using Computers.
Laptop is the device they use the most, then Desktop. None of them use Mobile or Tablet to go on-line.
100% of the participants Social Media, all of them use Facebook. Secondly they use Twitter and Pinterest in third place.
They use their personal website to showcase their portfolio.

BUSINESS

8 of them sell their work art in DegreeArt.com and 6 of this 8 also sell in their own website.
Just two of them sell in more than 2 places. Finally one does not sell his work in any of them.
It is very important for most of the artists to know about who the buyers background.
Some of the barriers mentioned for selling online are:
Time, Quality of Pictures, and Finding Buyers.
Artists feel very equipped about doing a full sale.
70% believe that is very important the role of the gallery in making a sale.
Background

Age

Artist Activity

Artist Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>engineering</th>
<th>Fine Art/Photography</th>
<th>Fine Art BA(Hons.) currently MA</th>
<th>BFA, MA fine art - painting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art Painting</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustration</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art Painting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of art produced.

**ONLINE galleries/organisations currently selling or exhibit**

- Painting: 40.91%
- Drawing: 18.39%
- Sculpture: 8.09%
- Photography: 3.50%
- Film: 3.17%
- Installation: 4.69%
- Other (Please Specify): 4.51%

**OFFLINE galleries/organisations currently selling or exhibit**

- 0-5: 90%
- 5-10: 10%

- 11-20: 5%
- 20+: 5%
Online Behaviour

Expertise using computers

On-line device

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Media used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinterest</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / None</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites to showcase portfolio/artwork

Importance of having access to some background information about the buyers purchasing work, where the work is going and keep some kind of contact.

BUSINESS

Sites selling art on-line

Importance of having access to some background information about the buyers purchasing work, where the work is going and keep some kind of contact.
Barriers for Selling online

Other text
- Very impersonal; it is art not products
- Ability to take good enough photographs of the work; that the online gallery has so many artists they have little knowledge about your work to pass onto clients, despite taking the same commission as a physical gallery
- Lack of buyers as tend to sell through galleries
- Having enough buyers to make enough money
- Finding the right audience
- Images of work, it is SOOOO hard to get my work to show well on this nut. I would love to show at the Dogrose Art gallery, maybe once a year? Maybe you'd be open to a print rack in the foyer. So it promotes all of us?

Artists Equipped to make and fulfill sales
Importance of the role of the gallery in making your sale.

Online presence will have a positive impact on your sales?
Buyers

BUYERS

For this target group the Questionnaire were divide by the information we needed Buyer’s Background, Online Behaviour, Buying Habits and Current Interaction.

BUYER’S BACKGROUND

In total there 12 people answer the questionnaires
The age was between 36 to 64.
Only 2 out of 10 has a background about art.
67% has more than 5 years of experience collecting art.
Only the 8% has stated collecting art in the past few months

ONLINE BEHAVIOUR

59% considered themselves Very Good and 41% Good using Computers.
Participants use most of the time the Laptop, the Desktop and finally a Tablet, None of the use Mobile to go on-line.
50% of the participants do not use Social Media
The other 50% most of them use Facebook.

BUYING HABITS

33% of the Participants buy Weekly art,
Every two weeks, Monthly and every few Months where the next.
Decoration was the main purpose of buying art, next was Collection
Average Expending Limit for buying art is £500-£1000
Most of them buy art in DegreeArt.com, artist’s or galleries website. 2 people do not buy
art online.
The main cause that prevent people from buying art is Money

INTERACTION

Preference of searching Art they prefer to have a balance between searching for an specific painting and browsing.
Categories that would you use to help refine a search for art is Style (57%), the Price(25%) and then Subject(18%).
Importance of the site to remember art recently viewed/show interest in.
36% important to see previous work of artists and 16% important to follow an artist.
Buyer's Background

**Age:**

![Pie chart showing age distribution](chart.png)

**Profession:**

- IT Consultant
- Arts administration
- Art student
- Retired
- Internet Engineer
- CEO
- Trainer
- Merchant Banker
- Wine merchant
- Retired academic, writer & management consultant
- Business Consultant
- Retired
Experience purchasing/collecting art

Online Behaviour

Expertise using computers
On-line device

Social media

Other text
Flipboard app
Stumbleupon
Buying Habits

Frequency of Buying Art

Purpose of buying Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spending limit when buying a piece of art

Websites participants uses to buy art online.

Online shop of gallery I knew was exhibiting favourite artist's work
Newblood art
Other gallery websites
Can't recall
Local galleries
Causes that prevent buying art.

Expense, whether it is already framed (more tempted if it is already attractively framed)

- No money
- Lack of time and resources
- Never enough money for all the art, ;-) 
- Money!
- Price
- Lack of money
- Cash or rather, the lack of it.
- Not having sufficient funds.

INTERACTION

Preference of searching Art
Categories that would you use to help refine a search for art.

Importance of the site to remember art recently viewed/show interest in.
Importance seeing a portfolio of an artist’s previous and current work.

Importance to be able to follow an artist and be updated on new work and what they are doing
GALLERIES

For this target group the Questionnaire were divide by the information we needed Galleries’ Background, Online Presence, Interaction.

GALLERIES’ BACKGROUND

56% of the Galleries have more then 5 years of experience
Most of the Galleries Represent between 1-5 Artists while a small percent(11%) represent more than 50 Artists.

ONLINE PRESENCE

The people who usually runs the Gallery website is the Gallery Director. Sometime are Staff Members or Outsourcing.
Galleries’ sites are updated weekly(33%) or daily (22%).
22% of the galleries do not use Social Media
All Participants who have Social Media use Facebook and Twitter. Linkedin is another choice for some of the Galleries.
67% Believe that having a strong online presence will improve their sales while 22% are undecided about this; These 22% are the same galleries who does not have Social Network and update the site 4 times a month.

INTERACTION

56% believe that is important for the site to remember art recently viewed/show interest in.
The amount of background galleries want to know about artists is some basic information(44%), while a 33% wants to know very detailed information.
44% believe that it is important to see previous work of artists.
33% of the galleries said that it is very important to follow an artist updates, while 11% believe it is unimportant, this 11% belongs to galleries that represent more than 50 artists.
Galleries’ Background

Years Open

Number of Artists Galleries represent
Online Presence

Online Content Manager

Me
- Aaron Hammond (gallery director)
- All staff members
- Shared between gallery directors
- Intake and myself
- Sample
- The owner and art dealer
- Intake and myself
- Gallery Director

Website Update

![Website Update Chart]

Other text:
- Only 4 times a year free of charge
- 4 times a year (their free service)
Social Media Usage

Social media preferences

Other next

Linked In

LinkedIn

want to use LinkedIn, but have problem with my password

not yet
Impact of having an online presence on sales

Interaction
Importance for a site to remember an artist recently viewed/show interest in.

Information of Artist's background/personality
Importance to see a portfolio of an artist’s previous and current work.

Importance to be able to follow an artist and be updated on new work and what they are doing.
User Research – Buyers & Galleries

Introduction & background

The purpose of the research is gain insight into Buyers' and Galleries' online goals, needs and preferences towards art ecommerce websites. This data will help to identify verified personas to cultivate the design development.

Research Objectives

To identify sub-personas within the user groups, Buyers and Galleries. They were tested at three art events, which each attract differing audiences with shared goals. These were: Tate Modern, Art 14 and First Thursdays.

Study Method

Both users were taken through a series of background questions using the approved research documents. Buyers were also asked to feedback on a series of website homepages: Artspace, DegreeArt, Saatchi Art, Byart and ArtFinder. Tate Modern visitors were interviewed by moderators outside the gallery's shop. Both Art 14 and First Thursdays were visitors were approached in various/respective exhibitions spaces.

Participants

Buyers at Tate Modern and Gallerists and Buyers at First Thursdays and Art 14. Tate Modern is one of London's most popular tourist attractions featuring accessible and commercial art. The research targeted visiting buyers, with a predicted lowest average spend on artworks but with the highest communality. It is the general public.

Art 14 is an annual art fair showcasing a range of respected and established artists, attracting the high-end, elite buyers and gallerists with the highest inventory/artwork price-point.

First Thursdays is a private view event of multiple pop-up exhibitions over one evening. It showcases the work of emerging artists at middle-end prices, attracting up-and-coming galleries and buyers who collectively influence the contemporary art scene from the bottom up.

Task

Buyers were first asked a series of introductory questions about their buying and online habits. They were then shown 5 selected homepages sequentially and asked the following questions after each:

1. What are your first impressions of the homepage?
2. Where would you choose to explore first and why?
Following this, the participants were asked to complete a user background questionnaire with the moderator. The entire test lasted approximately 40 minutes.

Galleries were asked to complete a user background questionnaire with the moderator. The entire test lasted approximately 20 minutes.

Workstation

- 2 x iPad
- QuickVoice (voice recorder app) with iPad
- Acrobat PDF Reader

Documents (PDF soft copies)

- Participant consent form
- Moderator script
- Participant task instructions
- Buyers background questionnaire
- Gallery background questionnaire

Procedure

- Participants were approached at random
- An introduction and background to the research was explained
- Upon agreement of the test circumstances the participant signed a consent form
- General introductory questions*
- Task*
- Background form
- The participant was thanked and the procedure was complete

*Buyers only.

The participants we approached and asked if they would be willing to partake in a short 15 minute research session on selected commercial art websites for a Kingston University project. They were read a short introduction about the process and aims and then asked to complete a consent form. They were then taken through the two research documents, recording their answers with QuickVoice and written notes.

Answers were applied directly onto the soft copy (in Acrobat Reader) and recorded with QuickVoice.

Results

Art 14

Galleries

Art 14 represented well established galleries, representing 10 - 49 artists. None sold through third party retailers, except a single gallery utilised private consultants' and galleries' platforms.
All galleries had a website for promotion and communication of exhibitions and new artworks. The majority were satisfied with their site, however, most did not include ecommerce, or intend to invest in ecommerce. Furthermore, they felt ecommerce would have no positive impact on their sales revenue.

Artwork price point was sited as the major reason not to include ecommerce. However one gallery did site technical limitations.

Lazarides, the ‘edgy’ gallery with claim to once represent Bansky and the lowest price-point, was the exception, and revealed that they “sell a lot online. Particularly on Friday nights, when workers came home from the pub drunk and made spontaneous purchases. The owner likened their business model to John Lewis’s, where the website runs in parallel and interdependently with their physical high street presence. Neither are secondary."

The websites were mostly maintained by gallery staff, as an additional responsibility to their role and with a very small proportion of time allocated to this. The content was updated for exhibitions and new artworks/artists, from every two weeks to 6 times a year. Their budget ranged from zero, or very little, up to a single instance of £1,200 annually.

CMSs Wordpress and an unknown ‘white-label’ platform were used, but the rest access front-end code to update their bespoke sites.

Buyers

Background

No buyers at Art 14 had purchased art online. Buyers cited needing to see art in its physicality as the reason. They also suggested not knowing where to go online but a desire to research prices.

Most preferred to buy art from an artist, over a gallery, as the money goes directly to the artist.

All buyers were 25-35, competent computer users and had been interested in collecting art for at least a year. Most spent time online via their smart phone utilising other websites and Facebook for irregular art information needs.

Art purchases were primarily for decoration with the majority spending up to £200. Barriers to purchasing art were viability of art within accommodation. When searching for art, buyers sited room location as a key way to refine there search, along side subject and style/genre.

Browsing navigation was led by imagery. It was very important for users to be able to see recently viewed items along with previous work from specific artists and their portfolio. Buyers saw value in being able to track an artists progress and their investment (after purchasing a piece).

Domain Feedback

Artspace

The ecommerce function was unclear and participants believed it to be an informational resource.

"I can't say I immediately know what it's there for. After 5 second I notice 'collector to collector' but I'm not a collector so it doesn't feel like it's for me."

Degree Art

Participants were mostly negative towards the busy layout of this page. They were drawn to interact with the 'Featured Artists' category – which consumes a large real estate and and the artwork image was clear and uninterrupted by text.
Saatchi Art
Participants recognised the Saatchi brand but assumed the content was a similar price point to the gallery’s. “I would confuse this with the Saatchi Gallery. I would try to find what’s on and not buy.”
Participants would interact with ‘One to Watch’ because it triggers curiosity and ‘Love Art’ to customise the content by ‘Artists or ‘Collector’. The latter was a misconception of the subscription data gathering form field function.

Byart
Although it received low aesthetic regard, the function was immediately clear, and participants recognised that it was an “art shop”.
“It’s so cluttered. It goes against the white cube principle of giving art room to breathe. This idea should run through the digital space as well, to create a consistent aesthetic/tone… I’d spread the paintings out a bit more and remove the header which has no value.”
The integrated social element (Facebook ‘Like’ API) was described as “poorly implemented” and could be improved with a user rating system.
The content was seen as impersonal and overwhelming.

Art Finder
Participants had an instant affinity with this site, describing it as, “clean, attractive, modern and clear. Obviously a shop too.” The name was said to help identify with the websites function. The call to action ‘Shop for Art’ is prominent and where all participants would start their user journey.
“The core principle categories match my navigation interests.”
For one participant, the design helped to empower a sense of control over their experience: “The receding/greyed out the catalogue behind ‘Shop for Art (unlike By Art where it is all laid out) makes me feel in control. I am making the decision to buy art.”

Tate Modern
Buyers
Background
The buyers’ age group was a full range, from 18 to 65 upwards, with mostly average to very good computer skills. The majority hadn’t used social networks to engage with art. Half had bought art online via artist and gallery websites (including tate.org.uk/visit/tate-modern). Those that hadn’t cited that they’d prefer to see artwork “in the flesh” or hadn’t previously considered art ecommerce.
Their purchase habit were sporadic and influenced by gallery visits and art fairs a few time a year.
Their average spend ranged from £0-50 to upwards of £1,000 – the highest buyers’ spend bracket.
Most buyers’ user journeys were led by imagery – interacting with content that visually attracted them.

Domain Feedback
Degree Art
Participants were mostly negative towards the busy layout of this page.
“I wouldn’t be attracted towards that one. If I was clicking through, I would probably leave that because it’s a bit cartoony.”
Artspace
Participants were mostly negative towards the busy layout of this page. They felt it was too cluttered and lacked cohesion.

“IT doesn't pull me in it's too cluttered. There's too much information on there, I don't know where to start... You need to be introduced to it chunk by chunk.”

Saatchi Art
This received a mixed reaction. Most participants recognised the brand Saatchi which immediately added interest and assurance to their perception of the homepage.

“Presumably because it is the Saatchi gallery, it has a wide range of choice. It helps because I know the gallery.”

Byart
This was the least regarded website, with no positive comments due to the busy modular layout and small text. One participant said, in a real scenario, they would leave the site.

“They're bombarding me and not actually telling me anything”

Art Finder
This was the best regarded website – there was no negative feedback and participants' liked the layout's white space, with comments such as:

“It's spread out and straight to the point”

“That’s more arresting. It focuses your mind a bit more...”

“I can take in what’s in each of those particular areas [categories]. There’s something for me to discuss in my head and... make a decision where I go next.”

For the large majority, navigational bars were ignored and participants were led by the pages' visual content. Their unanimous preference was Artfinder, for it's visually pared-back, simple and less cluttered approach.

Saatchi's established offline gallery space and well know brand helped participants to connect quickly and easily with the site and the artworks.

First Thursdays
Galleries
First Thursdays' hosted 5 exhibition private views, with relatively younger galleries representing emerging contemporary artists with very individual USPs, for example, artist run spaces and East Asian artists.

Galleries represented 1-49 artists, expect Vyner Street Galleries, a hire space, for group exhibitions.

Hada used the website, Artspace, as a third party retailer. All galleries had a website which they were satisfied with. Two galleries had commerce solutions, with the others citing price-points, lack of demand and lack of staff as reasons not to.

Two galleries strongly agreed that ecommerce would positively impact on their sales revenue and planned to invest in incorporating this into their site. One had a ball park figure. Those that did not
agree that ecommerce would have a positive impact on sales revenue, were not considering investing further.

The websites were run by Gallery Managers devoting a small percentage of their time on websites that they had outsourced for development. The exception to this was The Vyner Studio where the Gallery Director devoted half his time developing the website through Wix CMS.

All of the websites were built within the last 5 years. Time devoted to updates ranged from daily to monthly, which had some correlation with the size of the gallery. The more artists represented, the more updates necessitated with communication news.

The annually website budget ranged from £200 to £4,000.

Conclusion

Galleries

The smaller, younger galleries with presumably smaller revenue streams, spent more on the website in comparison to older more established brands, with presumably exponentially higher revenue.

The average annual figure for website development was £1,200. The average time spent developing the website was 17%. Most were built within the last 3 years, but most galleries had existed for 5 years or more.

All a galleries had a website for promotional purposes but the significant majority did not include, or intend to include ecommerce. The three galleries who valued and incorporated ecommerce, had inventory at lower price-point with less established artists.

Buyers

Background

Domain feedback

There was an association with the perception of the lay out as to the website's function. Art Space was considered to look like a blog, providing artist information. Whilst Byart had a clear ecommerce strategy, it was also assumed to be low value products.

For the large majority, navigational content was ignored and participants were led by the pages' visual content. The preferred site was Artfinder, for it's simple, pared-back and less cluttered approach. The brand name helped to define the site's purpose with a clear call to actions (and user journey). One buyer described "feeling more in control" of their buying experience.

Saatchi's established offline gallery space and well know brand helped participants to connect quickly and easily with the site and the artworks. However, there was a misconception that the website represented the same artists as the gallery and therefore would be unaffordable. The "ecommerce was too subtle".

Each buyer positively commented on the 'Love Art?' item. This is a data collection form to sign up for a newsletter subscription and asks users to choose whether they are a 'collector' or an 'artist'. In every case it was wrongly perceived to filter and personalise the website's content.

Limitations

The limitations are that we didn't know the size of the gallery i.e. the number of staff. This would have helped to understand the scale of their resources.
We should have identified the price point of the Galleries' artwork. The buyers surveyed at Art 14 were not a reflective range of visitors, which included celebrators and socialites making purchases over £60,000.

Recommendations
If a gallery app could overlay art into buyers homes via augmented reality, like the Ikea app (below), it might persuade buyers to shop online.

Provide a high quality, 360 degrees view of artwork, to allow buyers to inspect/scrutinise detail, like ASOS (left).

Content customisation like the misunderstood Saatchi website item of selecting 'collector' or 'artists'.

Curators, Organizations and Student Artists user research

Student Artists, Curators, and Art Organizations were asked to complete an online questionnaire (via KwikSurveys) about their background, online behavior, preferences and needs.

The results can be summarized as follows:

**Artists**

**Background**
MA Fine Art student from the Royal College of Art and Kingston University participated. The age range varied from 18 to 60+, but most were (33%) aged 25-35. Their academic fine art specialisms include: painting, illustration, sculpture, film, etching, ceramics, metalwork and engraving.

Just over half the students rated themselves as having ‘good’ computer competency, with 40%, ‘very good’. To go online, a large majority spent most of their time on laptops and desktops second. Facebook was the most popular social media network in relation to the students’ art (used by 30.5%), followed by Twitter (25%) and then, circa 10%, were Pinterest, Instagram, Cargo Collective & Tumblr.

**Online behaviour**
93% of students sold or exhibited with 0-5 offline and/or online galleries. 48% of students used their personal website to showcase their work and 20% used either Inside Out, Tumblr, Hire an Illustrator, Saatchi, SAOS, Open House Art or Trafo. However, only 28% sold artworks from their personal website, and the largest majority, 32%, used Degree Art as their ecommerce platform. Additional platforms used included, Not on the High Street, Rise Art and Saatchi. Artists felt it was very important to have some background knowledge of buyers (of their artworks).

The artists believed the following were barriers to selling online:
- Premium artwork was not suitable on this platform – only crafts
- The small online market is saturated – with more artists to buyers
- High quality artwork (photographic) documentation is difficult
- Targeting buyers
- Online galleries have less knowledge of their representatives to pass on to buyers.

Artists were mostly confident in their ability to make sales and cited galleries as key to that. They also felt that their online presence (via a personal website or the gallery’s) positively impacted on sales.

**Results Take Aways**
- **Tackle photographic document of a dynamic range of mediums**
- **Differentiate content from craft arts**

**Curators**

**Background**
Curators were sourced via the Kingston University Alumni network. Their age range was 25-49 with the majority having 5 or more years experience in the field. 62.5% worked with 1-9 galleries and a network of 1-49 artists. 50% of curators had purchased artwork online, primarily through the artists’ website (33%) or Artfinder. There was no overwhelming preference to purchasing directly through an artist or gallery.

**Homepage first impressions**

**Degree Art**
A positive first impression was – the “newspaper” style layout was attractive. Negative feedback was – the site was cost led, text heavy (and not enough imagery), no clear mission statement and “Special Offers” cheapened the integrity of the experience and artwork.

Their exploration of the site was research led, and the content which interested them most was ‘What’s On’, ‘New Art’, information on artists in residency, events and exhibitions.
Art Space
A positive first impression was that this was preferable and clearer. However, it was thought that the content could be condensed and the top banner was wasted real-estate. Their exploration would start at Featured Artists, Art Fairs and Artists and Partners.

Saatchi Art
The homepage layout was perceived to be clearer and more attractive than the previous sites. Prior knowledge of the brand also helped to affirm trust. Popular first touch-points were New Works, Featured Collections and filtering collections by Style.

Byart
This received the most negative feedback. It was regarded as dated, too busy, the imagery was too small and had no appeal. It was also thought that the ‘like’ /rating content should not be revealed on the homepage – it should just “focus on the artwork”.

ArtFinder
This received the most positive feedback. The layout was described as “nice”, clear content categories, articulate, and professional. However, negatives were the explicit ecommerce function (which conversely, was favoured by Buyers surveyed). It was though this distanced one’s personal connection with the artist.

Online behaviour
50% used mostly their laptop to go online, with the remaining 50% divided between laptop, desktop and tablet. Social media networks, Facebook, Pinterest, Twitter and Instagram were evenly used.

Purchasing / research habits
40% of curators researched new artworks daily – for collection and exhibitions. Popular blogs used in their research were: Bluin Art Info, Dezeen, Art Space, Art Newspaper, Art Review, e-flux, RA, Guggenheim, Phaidon Press Blog, Blueprint and Icon magazine. A typical price-point was circa £5,000 and upwards.

Interaction
Curators’ navigation was led by both image and style/genre of art. 80% regarded it as important to very important for the site to cache recently viewed artworks. Following and viewing an artists’ full portfolio was seen as important.

Results Take Aways
• Artwork price-point should be hidden on the homepage
• Their experience is about research and investigation – learning of artworks and their background (in contrast with buyers who are price driven).

Art Organisations
Background
The Art Organisations contacts were sourced via Degree Art. They had been established for 2 or more years. All organisations’ were commercial enterprises, and described as “art fairs”. Their gallery portfolio ranged from 1-9 to more than 100 and the number of artists ranged from just 1 to more than 100.

Online behaviour
100% of organizations had a website as a promotional tool, which they were mostly satisfied with but found it difficult to keep them up to date. These had been built 3 years ago. 50% had ecommerce built into their site. Barriers to its inclusion included the cost of integration and the management of sales. One organization did not deal with artwork sales however all had plans to develop the ecommerce functionality. Annually website maintenance costs were £10,000.

5-14% of their week was spent on website updates and administrators had full access to the website code, content backup files and domain name to control their online presence – using both external
developers and inhouse staff to oversee the upkeep. Embedded Twitter and Facebook feeds were used to automatically update the website content.

Results Take Aways

- Full website (back-end) content access
- Social network integration
- Scalable catalogue of artists and galleries
Artellite Social Media Survey Scope of Work

Research to be carried out across PC/Mac, Tablet and Mobile.

A report to be provided covering the current Social Media landscape in the commercial Arts sphere and a Best Practice document for artists, galleries and arts organisations using Social Media to market their work.

Listening: What is currently happening?

1) What are artists saying, doing, searching, sharing on SM?
2) What are Arts Organisations and galleries doing?
3) How are buyers interacting with them? What is leading to transactions?

Insights: What are our competitors doing?

1) Who is doing well at SM, who is doing it badly?
2) A chart of the top performing SM platforms for the Visual Arts

Strategy: What needs to be done?

1) How can we get artists to use SM better/ more effectively to generate greater interaction with their work, ensure they project a professional image as well as respecting and complimenting gallery/ arts organisation relationships they may have? What must they avoid doing?
2) What can we build into the designs that will help with this/ make it second nature?
3) How can galleries and arts organisations use SM better to advantage the gallery and promote their artists/ organisations and reach the intended + new audiences.

Finally: How can the Arts Industry best respond to the constantly changing Social Media landscape?

Contact: Elinor Olisa Elinor@DegreeArt.com 07971 456 396
Scope of Work

Background

Whilst the comparable industries of Music and Fashion have embraced it, the Art World has been slow to recognise and take up the potential of the Internet as a viable selling tool.

DegreeArt has been running for 10 years and we still to this day face the same question we faced when we were setting up ‘but who would buy art online’?

The answer is simple – a lot of people. Our clients range from Internet aficionados first time art buyers right up to older, less technically savvy but art educated clients. When we founded DegreeArt people would say’ I would never buy a dress online or do my supermarket shop on a website,’ yet those same people are doing both these things today and it has become second nature to us. We believe that the clients are ready and willing but they are simply not being provided with access to the many galleries and many more artists out there creating own lable art.

So why hasn’t the Art World been as fast to embrace the potential of Ecommerce.

Well we believe that there are 5 main reasons why we avoid or fail in our ecommerce endeavours:

1. The costs involved in designing, building and importantly maintaining a website
2. A fear that our screens will be too much of a barrier between us and the actual tangible object – People need to see and feel my work
3. Putting prices of artwork online – I don’t want everyone seeing my prices?!
4. Understanding of the role of the gallery – people bypassing the gallery system for short term gains that damage the long term for all
5. That there are no rules or agreed best practice for galleries and artists to abide by so galleries avoid it and artists dabble without direction or guidance

The Proposition

DegreeArt has spent the last decade working out how to not just sell art online, but how to manage relationships online including, specifically those of the gallery and artist, the gallery and client and the artist and client.

Last year we started a project to work with our artists to help them to establish mutually beneficial online profiles as we were coming up across situations that were impeding on our business model, the sale and therefore, fundamentally the art eco-system which relies on artists making sales to be able to fund further work.

We believe that the gallery as an institution, in this eco system, is essential and cannot be removed from the chain. The gallery acts not just as a broker but deals with the marketing, fulfillment and support system for the artists they act for.

Artists are going to work with more than simply one gallery today but this relationship must be managed so that all involved can benefit and continue in their marketing of the artist.

We are researching into what artists, buyers, galleries and arts organisations currently have on offer, what they would like and what do they need as well as what they need to make the online an attractive offering to them. We are using this research to create a piece of Best Practice that each party can use to
govern their online presence and transactions.

It is fundamental that we all start to understand how to work online

Alongside this, we are developing a piece of bespoke technology to allow each to create and manage online presences that are linked together providing consistency for the industry.

**Objectives**
The key benefits we hope to see emerge from this are:

1. Artists, galleries and arts organisations being able to have industry bespoke technology for their websites. Specifically a system that will allow us to provide a fully functioning ecommerce solution for the Affordable Art Fair, their galleries and artists (or comparable business).
2. Clear guidelines for artists and galleries to enable them to create mutually beneficial relationships.
3. Future proof the existence of the Art World online

**Target Market**
The target market includes:
- Commercial Artists
- Existing and Potential Art Buyers
- Commercial Art Galleries
- Commercial Arts Organisation

Our initial user research involved using questionnaires targeted at each of the target market groups. Please see below a summary of our research findings:

**Artists**
Please see below a summary of the research findings for this target group using a questionnaire to find insights into the artist background, their online behaviour and whether they sell their work online.

**Artists’ Background**
In total 10 artists completed the questionnaire. The average age was between 25 to 35 years. Most of the artists were Full-Time artists, graduated from an Art discipline. Painting is the art that is produced the most.

**Artists Online Behaviour**
- 60% of artists considered themselves Good and 40% Very Good at using Computers. Laptop is the device they use the most, then Desktop. None of them use Mobile or Tablet to go on-line.
- 100% of the participants use Social Media and all of them use Facebook. Secondly they use Twitter and Pinterest was in third place. They use their personal website to showcase their portfolio.

**Business**
- 8 of the artists sell their art on DegreeArt.com and out of these 8 artists 6 artists also sell on their own website. Just two of artists sell in more than 2 places. Finally one does not sell his work online.
- It is very important for most of the artists to know about the buyers background. Some of the barriers mentioned for selling online include Time, Quality of Pictures, and Finding Buyers.
- 70% of the artists believe that the role of the gallery in making a sale is very important.

**Buyers**
Please see below a summary of the research findings for this target group using a questionnaire to find insights into the Buyer’s Background, Online Behaviour, Buying Habits and Current Interaction.
Buyers’ Background
In total, there were 12 buyers who completed the questionnaire.
• Their age was between 36 to 64.
• Only 2 out of 10 buyers have an art background.
• 67% of the buyers have more than 5 years of experience collecting art.
• Only 8% of buyers has stated collecting art in the past few months

Online Behaviour
• 59% considered themselves Very Good and 41% Good at using Computers. The participants use laptop most of the time, then desktop and tablet. However, none of the participants use Mobile to go on-line.
• 50% of the participants do not use Social Media while the other 50% most of them use Facebook.

Buying Habits
• 33% of the Participants buy Weekly art, Every two weeks, Monthly and every few Months where the next.
• Decoration was the main purpose of buying art, next was Collection
• Average Expend Limit for buying art is £500-£1000
• Most of them buy art on DegreeArt.com, artist’s or galleries website.
• 2 people do not buy art online. The main cause that prevent people from buying art is Money.

Interaction
• The participants prefer to have a balance between searching for specific painting and browsing.
• The categories that they would use help in refining their search for art is Style (57%), Price (25%) and then Subject (18%)
• 36% of the participants stated that it is important to see previous work of artists and 16% stated that it is important to follow an artist.

Galleries
Please see below a summary of the research findings for this target group using a questionnaire to find insights into the galleries’ Background, Online Presence and Interaction.

Galleries’ Background
• 56% of the galleries have more than 5 years of experience.
• Most of the galleries represent between 1-5 Artists while a small percentage (11%) represent more than 50 Artists.

Online Presence
The people who usually manage the gallery website is the Gallery Director. Sometime they are Staff Members or they Outsource the site management.
• Galleries’ sites are updated weekly (33%) or daily (22%).
• 22% of the galleries do not use Social Media. All Participants who have used Social Media, they use Facebook and Twitter. LinkedIn is another choice for some of the galleries.
• 67% of galleries believe that having a strong online presence will improve their sales while 22% are undecided about this; These 22% are the same galleries who does not have Social Network and update the site 4 times a month.

Interaction
• 56% of the galleries believe that it is important for the site to remember art recently viewed/show interest in.
• The amount of background information that the galleries would like to know about artists is some basic information (44%), while a 33% would like to know very detailed information.
• 44% of the galleries believe that it is important to see the artists’ previous work.
• 33% of the galleries said that it is very important to follow an artist updates, while 11% of galleries who represent more than 50 artists believe that it is unimportant.

Art Organisations
We are still waiting to receive the completed questionnaires from the art organizations.

Scope
The scope of this project can be summarised as follows:

Research:
To produce a piece of ground breaking research into the commerciality of art online, reaching out and researching beyond the existing DegreeArt community, producing results that will impact industry behaviour and influence the technology build.

Research Specific Requirements:
1. Understand what each target audience is currently doing online
2. What are the current barriers preventing each from selling and buyers from buying
3. Understand what needs are not currently being met
4. What can we learn from what competitors are doing
5. What in the current DegreeArt offering should be taken across to the new platform
6. How can we improve searching for art to own

DegreeArt: To share our industry knowledge to benefit others whilst growing the DegreeArt business. Produce a report on the project for Nesta and to meet the Nesta requirements

Process, Deliverables and Sign-off
The process can be summarised as follows:

• Sprint 0 - Strategic Planning & Scoping
• Sign-Off: Upon the Scope of Work document sign-off the development sprint 1 begins.
• Sprint 1 - Development
• Sprint 2 - Production
• Delivery

The Creative Concept
The Artellite digital platform will be the definitive best practice tool that artists & arts organisations use to deepen their relationship with existing markets, and reach new audiences, in a financially sustainable way. It will do this by means of core digital design mechanics that will engineer current engagement with arts and culture online, from the ‘Access’, through ‘Learn’, to ‘Experience’ & ‘Share’ modes as defined by the MTM Report on “Digital audiences: Engagement with arts and culture online”.

Content Strategy
The Artellite project will deliver a comprehensive strategy for the storage and use of all art and artefacts (i.e. images, text and data) included by Artellite. For this content, the key strategic objectives are: to establish Artellite as an effective Portal for buyers to find, discover and purchase Art; to devise and
implement effective mechanisms to ensure that Artists provide compelling supporting content about their work; and to survey the landscape of further opportunities for re-organization and creative use of this content, to help the Artellite project grow in both features and scale.

An important component of the content, and therefore of the strategy, is the set of captured images representing the artwork being sold via Artellite. The strategy needs to accommodate suitable data handling practices to ensure that the objectives can be met. Specifically, the Artellite system can be engineered to facilitate the analysis of image content, to support these objectives by providing services such as content-based image retrieval, search for similar pictures (or identical copies), and image quality assessment and improvement. This initiative will require an appropriate integration of the image-indexing data storage and processing capabilities, alongside the existing enterprise content managements systems (for all the text-based content). The integration strategy should use encapsulated and service-oriented architectures wherever possible, to accommodate future technologies and business opportunities that are beneficial to the Artellite project.

**Technical Audit**

Build a fully functioning platform in Drupal 7 that will allow DegreeArt to provide their target audiences with a way of reaching and selling artwork to buyers online. Take the best parts of DegreeArt and add on elements as decided from the research findings. Please see below a summary of the phased technical development:

**Phase 1:**
To develop a prototype to be used by Kingston University for research. The idea is to make sure we can deliver the project and handle the backend complexity.
Results: basic hub build using drupal 7 + web services

**Phase 2:**
To build for public release used by 1 gallery only: Affordable Art Fair (AAF)
At this stage we have 80% of the functionality build and working.
Results: improved hub + improved microsite client with 1 custom design

**Phase 3:**
To build for Public release with marketing. To allow more artists and galleries to join.
Results: improved hub + improved microsite client with 5 custom design templates for artists and 3 custom design templates for galleries (TBC)

**Site Structure**
A sitemap will be produced during Sprint 1, the site development phase.

**Project Team and Timescales**
The project team includes the following:
For the project timescales, please see the attached project plan.

**Contact Details**

Elinor Olisa - elinor@degreeart.com
Karen Cham - K.Cham@kingston.ac.uk
Developing Personas & User Journeys
Understanding artists’ use of social media

Proposal developed for Degree Art
13 January 2014

Your objectives

1. To understand how artists use social media with a particular focus on driving marketing and sales
2. To reach beyond the artists already known to Degree Art
3. To develop a view of best practice in order to be able to advise emerging artists how best to use social media

Our approach

There are three key steps necessary to meet the objectives:

1. Finding the right social media accounts on key channels (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Pinterest)
2. Analysing the statistics and content to ascertain what works and what doesn’t
3. Comparing use in order to determine effectiveness

It is time-consuming to identify artists in the UK on social media (in common with any other group of people) without any other piece of qualifying information such as a name and analysing users’ content both in depth and at scale can also be a significant investment.

We believe that the most cost-effective way to meet the objectives will be through a two-stage project:

1. A quantitative survey, distributed through your website and social media profiles to identify how artists use social media
2. A qualitative assessment (including a review of content and interview with the artists) to develop case studies of how particular artists are using social media

Stage one: Quantitative survey

We recommend using SurveyMonkey and distributing the survey through Degree Art’s existing web presence. The survey should examine four areas of social media activity:
1. Channels
   a. Which channels do they use?
   b. What’s the size of their networks?
2. Role
   a. What is the purpose of each channel? (eg. ideas generation, networking, marketing, sales)
   b. How does this differ according to the channel?
   c. Who do they particular admire / learn from?
3. Content
   a. How often do they post?
   b. What type of content do they post (eg. photos, links, check-ins)?
   c. What content has been most / least effective?
   d. Have they / how have they used advertising?
4. Evaluation
   a. To what extent has social media met their expectations?
   b. Have they changed anything that they do to align it with audience expectations?
   c. How do they expect social media use to change in the next 6/12 months?

Recruitment

We believe that your 6,000 Facebook likes and 4,000 Twitter followers, combined with website visitors, provides a good basis for identifying survey respondents. If you are able to provide an incentive (perhaps a prize draw) that would further boost responses. However, we also suggest the following activities:

1. MTM will contact the c. 250 artists and sector specialists in its database
2. We will purchase c. £50 worth of Facebook advertising to promote the survey
3. We will spend half a day using your Twitter account to send @ replies to increase survey responses

However, if this yields a lower than expected number of responses, there is insufficient budget for MTM to do anything further to generate replies.

We will analyse the results of this survey to develop a typology of social media use, as a way of understanding the various different behaviours and performance.

Stage two: Qualitative assessment

We will conduct a structured interview with 10 of the most effective artists to understand in greater detail:

- How they interact with audiences
- Practically, how social media fits into their daily processes / habits
- What advice they would give other users

Outputs

- A report analysing the survey results, written in an accessible way to facilitate marketing for Degree Arts
- Data tables to enable deeper analysis
MTM – Degree Art proposal

- 10 case studies of effective artists, supported by a ‘Top 10 social media tips’ guide for emerging artists

Price: £4,000 + VAT

MTM’s standard terms and conditions

All expenses will be charged at cost. Expenses typically include the costs of travel, report production, research materials, communications, printing costs, room bookings and refreshments, consumables and any other miscellaneous costs incurred by MTM, according to our standard policy. VAT will be charged on fees and expenses.

We will invoice the client for the 50% of the fees upon commencement of the project, and for the remaining 50% plus expenses upon completion. All invoices must be paid within 30 days. We reserve the right to charge interest at 5% per month thereafter.

We will devote our best efforts to the work that will be performed in this assignment. Any findings, conclusions and recommendations and any written material that we provide will represent our best professional judgement based on the information that is available to us.
TAGS

You’ve uploaded a work for sale. You’re asked to provide some ‘tags’ to describe this work.

You can choose a pool of possible tags, from your past terms, commonly used terms, lay terms or professional terms, which you can ‘drag’ into the box holding the tags for your work.

You’ve also got blank tags you can fill in, with whatever word you want.

You can drag them back again if you change your mind.

If you click on a tag in the pool, then similar tags are added to the pool.

Once you have got a set of tags you are happy with, you can click ‘Save’ and then your work will be categorised and then shown to people using these tags as search terms.

FRAMING

You’ve uploaded a work of art for sale.

You have a choice of different techniques to ‘frame’ the work to present this work on the website.

You can select and/or upload a background, choose a frame or install it in an environment.

You select the ‘framing’ that you think best complements your work, and click ‘continue’.

You check the website, and the frame you selected is used to show your work.
CONTEXT

You've uploaded a work for sale. You're asked to provide some 'tags' to describe this work. Rather than use words or framing to provide help define your work, you click the box that indicates that you would prefer to be contextual, and choose three items that compliment or contextualise your work. You decide on "art deco", "1950s Fashion" "Amy Winehouse" and "Bob Dylan"

These tags are then used to contextualise the display of your art.

SIMILAR

You have uploaded a work of art, you are trying to write the description but you are having trouble in getting started.

You press a button marked 'show me an example': it brings up a quite similar work of art, with the related description.

You press the button marked 'next example' a few times, and then return to one you'd seen earlier by pressing the 'previous' button.

This browsing has given you a couple of ideas and you manage to start and eventually finish the description of your own work of art.

The painting was created using a base layer of modelling paste to add a sense of depth and texture and to enhance painting on a rough concrete surface. I chose oversaturated colours to detach the painting from reality. This piece is framed with a simple black wooden frame which enhances the painting.

“I'll let you be in my dreams if I can be in yours”
Bob Dylan, 1963
FEEDBACK

After you have completed uploading and describing your latest works of art, you get the option to choose which users of degreeeart are given the opportunity to provide you with feedback about the way your work is presented.

You get to choose which of these give you feedback:
- Customers
- Other Artists
- Journalists
- Curators
- Gallery Owners
- Agents

and you receive their suggestions via email or by logging into the degreeeart website.
Personas

GALLERY

PERSONA TYPE Mid-Rise-Paint Gallery
NAME Ellie Osborne
AGE 36
JOB TITLE Gallery Director
LOCATION North London

"A high number of our online sales are made late on Friday nights – after the pub!"

Ellie Osborne

// About
Ellie owns and runs a gallery space in East London's Vyner Street which has a USP of cultivating graduate and emerging artists. She currently represents 5 artists and the average inventory price point is £2,000 to £5,000.

The gallery is small, with no contracted staff but she has a large network of peers and freelancers to assist with the construction of shows, design event collateral and photography.

She uses Wix, a cloud-based web development platform, to create the gallery websites and 50% of her time is devoted to updating its content – with new artworks and communications.

// Motivations
- Need to be able to upload large media files, on the fly, from Google Drive via her smartphone
- She is experienced with front-end development, and would like to have full access to the HTML and CSS to adjust styles and layout

// Frustrations
- When the server can't transfer files directly from Google Drive
- An attractive and intuitive interface
- The ability to access Artesia's front-end, from multiple devices

// Experience Goals
- Ensure that any updates to the gallery website can be uploaded and previewed within one hour, from any device
- To be able to edit images and videos on the go, using her Google Drive

Computer attitude
Use of social networking
There is no demand for art commerce for originals of this price-point

// About
Charles Coste Street Gallery was established in the late 80s, and its USP is classical and contemporary photography. Inventory prices range from £5,000 to £20,000 with a portfolio of 26 artists. The gallery website was co-designed with Charles' cousin, a web developer, 6 years ago. The appearance and functionality are quite dated now but it suffices as a promotional medium. There is no CMS, and the only staff member with HTML knowledge is the Communications Assistant, who makes updates every couple of months, when she has time. There is also no ecommerce functionality but Charles believes clients would be uncomfortable paying this value online.

// Motivations
- To refresh the website interface – to be responsive and adaptive
- Affect a wider network of collectors and buyers into the off-the-shelf gallery space
- Introduce ecommerce for the sale of exhibition collateral and limited edition prints
- Create contextual metadata so buyers can make complex semantic searches for artworks

// Experience Goals
- An easy CMS interface which can be adopted by all staff members with a range of computer aptitudes
- Able to adapt the interface to reflect the gallery's brand
- Capability of loading image heavy content, quickly
- Increase gallery revenue

// Frustrations
Slow loading time

// Ideal Experiences
An attractive easy to manage site
- A mobile-optimized version so he can view the gallery portfolio when away from his desk

---------

I'm always travelling for work, so I like to pick up pieces for my home from around the world

// About
Akua Ossei works for an online fashion retail group and travels extensively with her job. She is based in both New York and London and collects art from exhibitions and art fairs all over the world to decorate her flats. Her price range and list styles are medium to modest which meets her choice of artworks.

She has multiple devices on her person, for both consumption and production of work.

She is a keen social networker, for her job and to maintain communication with friends and family whilst travelling.

// Motivations
- To engage with trends within the art scene
- To make her home beautiful
- To follow the progress of her investments – monitoring the careers of artists and galleries she has purchased work from

// Experience Goals
- Intelligent contextual searches
- Contains information on the background and theory of artists' work
- Clear artwork-specific dimensions and weight
- High-quality photographs allowing for close-up viewing and accurate colour reproduction

// Frustrations
- Short attention span, so hates slow loading pages
- Non-responsive and non-adaptive website content. She accesses content primarily through mobile devices and hates being served up desktop versions

// Ideal Experiences
- An attractive easy-to-use site
- A mobile-optimized version which works on low bandwidth (for hotel checkout)
- Wi-Fi connection
- Discover new artists and galleries to visit
**Nigel Brentwood**

**Persona Type:** Low-risk, Paint Buyer

**Name:** Nigel Brentwood

**Age:** 65

**Job Title:** Retired Engineer

**Location:** Hampshire

---

**About**

Nigel is a retired Engineer who now paints as a hobby. He enjoys sharing his passion for the arts with his grandchildren, and takes them to London to visit the art galleries during the school holidays. He especially loves Tate Britain, the Turner Room and the reopened restaurant – where he can contemplate the day’s learnings within a beautiful interior.

In terms of possessions, he and his wife live a minimal lifestyle but occasionally buy high-quality print reproductions or local artists’ originals for their home – as and when something inspires them.

He is a confident, frugal user and takes it everywhere so he can keep up to date with current affairs and to entertain his grandchildren.

---

**Frustrations**

- When you are unable to see an entire artwork, it is cropped by the image frame
- Cluttered pages with no obvious call to action/purpose
- Small text which is difficult to read

---

**Ideal Experiences**

- An attractive, easy to use site
- To interest his grandchildren
- Discover new artists and galleries to visit

---

**Motivations**

- To inspire his painting practice
- To follow and support local artists

**Experience Goals**

- Lots of visual stimulation
- Uncrowded and easy to navigate
- Filter results by both medium and price
- Simple ecommerce system which remembers his account details

---

**Sofia Cotttingham**

**Persona Type:** Graduate Artist

**Name:** Sofia Cotttingham

**Age:** 30

**Job Title:** Student

**Location:** Uxbridge

---

**About**

Sofia is a 3rd year RCA MA student in Fine Art Painting. Upon graduating (this year) she hopes to share a studio with 5 peers in South West London, painting full-time and guest lecturing at the college.

She has recently obtained representation from the Sadie Coles Gallery but hopes to improve her networking skills to help increase her exposure as an emerging artist – and (soon to be) RCA graduate.

She has average computer skills. Her practice doesn’t necessitate digital work but she uses her laptop daily for research and image storage.

---

**Motivations**

- To build professional connections
- Increase exposure
- Create a revenue stream
- Connect and support peers

**Experience Goals**

- To have access and control over her personal webpage
- Have some knowledge of potential buyers’ background and credentials
- Clear and easy shipping process
- A simple ecommerce system
- A layout with lots of white space to allow the artwork to breathe

---

**Frustrations**

- Poor quality images
- Cluttered layouts
- Lack of control

**Ideal Experiences**

- An attractive, easy to use site
- To increase the value of her name (brand) and artwork

---

**Prior to signing with Sadie Coles, I used to sell via Degree Art and a number of other online ecommerce sites.**
ARTIST

Matt Ayling

PERSONA TYPE  Established artist
NAME  Matt Ayling
AGE  56
JOB TITLE  Artist
LOCATION  North London

“Networking is a fundamental part of an artist's practice”

About
Matt studied Fine Art at Falmouth College of Art and came to London after graduating. He and his family live in North London, where he paints from a converted annex at the end of their garden. An average painting is worth £3,000 to £5,000.

He has representation from two West London Galleries and contracts to maintain a supply of artworks. He also sells through personal websites which he has made himself with Dreamweaver. The functionality is limited and the fact it could be improved with interactive and social features.

Motivations
- To increase his network of professional connections
- Increase exposure
- Improve the aesthetics and functionality of his personal websites

Frustrations
- Poor quality images
- Cluttered layouts

Ideal Experiences
- An attractive, easy to use site
- To increase the value of his name (brand) and artwork

Experience Goals
- To have access and control over the personal website
- Have some knowledge of potential buyers’ background and credentials
- Clear and easy shipping process
- A safe e-commerce system
- A layout with lots of white space to allow the artwork to breathe
- Interactive features
# Content Development

## Content Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Structure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Keep (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>External Users Available for Artists/Both</th>
<th>Internal Users - Use, Update, New Content</th>
<th>Type (functionality, text, image, rich)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Homepage</td>
<td><a href="http://www.degreeart.com/">http://www.degreeart.com/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td>Maybe better to have a more obvious section for artists where they can find out what the site is about and join</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Top Navigation</td>
<td>General site features such as 'about' 'blog' 'contact' 'wish list' and 'shopping basket' 'login up/log in' 'news letter'. Text with icons</td>
<td>Mostly Buyers Artists / 'About' and 'Join Us'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Links to site features that have more secondary functions to finding and buying art with more of a focus to explain the company, site and features. Remains at the top of the page on all pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Art Navigation</td>
<td>Offers options to view art work using different categories; some categories have sub category options to choose from</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Links with drop down options to categories and sub categories of art work including - All art, gift shop, inspiration, price, size, new art and A-Z. Remains at the top of the page on all pages</td>
<td>This way of showing categories is more engaging however takes up more space and makes it harder to show sub categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Art Category Features</td>
<td>A few of the categories available in the art navigation bar however each with an image and description</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Images with a category title that links to art and a 4 line text description underneath</td>
<td>Useful and engaging feature, however for featured artists it may be better to include a video or something that showcases the person and their style rather than just their artwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Featured Art and Artists</td>
<td>A large artwork image with the artists name and basic details of their work linking to the artwork and other work by the artist, this sits next to an automatic scrolling box of art work with basic details linking to a page that show the work in greater detail</td>
<td>Buyers (artists may be interested to see if they have been featured)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>A large image of artwork with artists name, title of artwork, price, short description of work and link to 'view all' that links to the artists profile. Artwork scrolling box is made up of small images of artwork with details incl title, price, artist and short description linking to artwork shown in more detail. Artwork scrolls roughly every 4 seconds</td>
<td>Text descriptions often just repeat the category titles and no new information, may be better to briefly describe what each category is with definitions for category titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Art Category Slider</td>
<td>Medium sized images of artwork with category titles scrolling across the page</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slider scrolls through art categories 4 at a time roughly every 5 seconds. Each category has an image of art work with text underneath briefly describing the category</td>
<td>Could do with more information other then just a title and image and should be set to the centre of the page with twitter feed along side and not underneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Blog, Events and Twitter</td>
<td>A medium/large image each for the blog and events feature with a twitter feed underneath</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>An image for each feature with a title, each linking to the blog and event page. Images are set to left of centre of the page. Underneath is a small twitter feed which scrolls down in a box to see more tweets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Art Search</td>
<td>degreeart.com/taxonomy/term/all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Options to re-order art work displayed by most recent, highest price and lowest price with other options to select how much art work from a search is displayed underneath ranging from 32 to all</td>
<td>May benefit from better/more sorting options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Sorting</td>
<td>Options set in a bar for re-ordering and displaying artwork underneath</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Options to re-order art work displayed by most recent, highest price and lowest price with other options to select how much art work from a search is displayed underneath ranging from 32 to all</td>
<td>May benefit from better/more sorting options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Users</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Refine</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Refine Search</td>
<td>Side bar on the left of the page with sections to help refine the search by price, size, colour, location, occasion and medium</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Refine search is split into sections each with options that can be selected acting as filters for what art work is displayed in the centre of the page. Selections are mostly made of tick boxes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Art Work Search Results</td>
<td>List of art work shown in rows of four with an image, title, size and price number of pieces shown depends on how many a user has chosen to display</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Search results show a small image with text details underneath for each artwork with a 'new' sticker attached for new pieces. Could benefit from larger images for each artwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Artwork Search degreart.com / [category]/[art artist]/[title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Buyer Options</td>
<td>A bar at the top of the art work with the title and description links to page to save to a wish list or buy the piece with additional options underneath to view more of the artists work, request a viewing, request more info or commission a piece by the artist.</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Options which open up emails to complete the action may feel like you are exiting the site too much and may be better being sent with in a site page or being opened in another tab.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Art Details</td>
<td>A large image of the artwork to the left of information about the piece that includes title, who it by, social media sharing options, year of creation, dimensions and a description b the artist about the piece.</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>Other than options to enlarge the image in a separate page, social media options, selecting the artists name and buying the piece the rest of this section is made up of text description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 'Show Against'</td>
<td>A bar of options that a buyer selects to change the colour/texture of the background that the artwork is displayed on.</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Options can be selected to update the background of the artwork image above. The options include a colour palette and 4 texture options that include brick, plaster and wood panels. A good feature to have to help buyers make a decision however may take up too much 'prime' space on the page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 More by/about the Artist</td>
<td>A small scroll box in which the buyer can select to view 'more by the artist' or 'more about the artist' with the first being automatically selected</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>Viewing other work by the artist allows the buyer to scroll through work displayed with a small image, title, dimensions and price with two pieces being shown at a time. More about the artist' shows a description written by the artist with a link to read more on their profile. These features could be displayed better to be more engaging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 'May also Like'</td>
<td>A selection of small artwork images displayed across the page with title, artist and price.</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Images link to a page dedicated to the artwork with text informing the buyer of the title, artist and price.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Artist's Profile degreart.com /users/[userna me]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Artist Information</td>
<td>Basic information about the artist that includes a profile pic, where and what they studied, links to contacting about the artists and viewing work and social media options (Facebook, Pinterest and Twitter)</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>A small profile pic with text description. Links to contacting for more info and commissioning work and viewing artwork with social media icons for sharing/liking an artists page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Artist Interview</td>
<td>A set interview that artists can answer to help buyers get to know the artists background more</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>A scroll box with interview questions in bold text with artists answers in normal text. May be better placed further down the page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Latest Artwork</td>
<td>Medium sized images of latest artwork displayed across the page that can be scrolled through with titles and dimensions and an option at the top to view all artwork which is displayed in the same layout as the artwork search page</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>Side scrolling box with images of artwork that link to their own page with text descriptions underneath of title and dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Artist's Statement</td>
<td>A description of the artist, their techniques, previous experience and approach to art written by the artist</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>Flat text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Exhibitions</td>
<td>A list of exhibitions that the artist has featured in with year, exhibition title and location</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists</td>
<td>Flat Text Could benefit from having links to the exhibition website/organizers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Recently Sold</td>
<td>A list of medium/small artwork images with title and dimensions displayed across the page</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Artists/Degree Art</td>
<td>Images of artwork that link to their own dedicated page with text information of title and dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Registering</td>
<td><a href="http://www.degreeart.com/user/register/shopper">http://www.degreeart.com/user/register/shopper</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Personal Details</td>
<td>All required field boxes that ask for name, gender, email address, phone number and date of birth</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td>Information boxes to be filled in by the user/buyer with date of birth and gender selected from drop down options Some details may seem too personal such as date of birth and telephone number and can be off putting to begin with unless explained why it is needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Address Details</td>
<td>All required field boxes for address such as town, post code and country other than county which is not required</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td>Information boxes to be filled in by the user/buyer with country selected from options in a drop down box Would be good to explain why address is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Account Details</td>
<td>All required fields of Username and Password with confirmation</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td>Information boxes to be filled in by the user</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Other Details</td>
<td>Required field boxes asking where they found out about the site and a verification code</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree Art</td>
<td>Information boxes to be filled in by the user</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Buyer's Profile/Control Panel</td>
<td>degreart.com/control-panel</td>
<td>Control panel page has three options of edit profile, view my orders and connect with Facebook each with their own icons linking to their own sub-page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Edit Profile</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dgreart.com/user/3010/edit?dest=control-panel">http://www.dgreart.com/user/3010/edit?dest=control-panel</a></td>
<td>A top bar of options that allows the user/buyer to update the details entered at registry however split in to account, address, feedback, how did you hear about us and personal details Extra information can be added that was not there at registry such as uploading profile picture, gift certificate redemption (in account) what is the reason for purchase (in feedback) personal website, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and Pinterest details (in personal details)</td>
<td>Buyers</td>
<td>Degree Art + Buyers</td>
<td>The bar at the top shows the different sections of the profile that can be edited written in pink text. In each of the sections are boxes that can be filled in, boxes that can be ticked or drop down option to select from with a pink save button at the bottom to confirm and save changes. Saving brings up a box letting you know the changes have been saved and needs to be closed down to remove the message. Some of the boxes have small text to help the user fill it in or let them know what it is for. Some options are confusing and unnecessary such as uploading a profile picture when there isn't really a proper profile page and asking for how they found the site in the feedback option as well as a separate 'how did you hear about us' option. Profile sections at the top are a little hidden. Gift certificate feature is under account which may not be obvious place to find it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 View my Orders
http://www.degreetart.com/user/3010/orders?estimation=control-panel
A table of orders showing date, order, status, products and total. A small image can be selected to organize how orders are displayed in the table
Buyers
Buyers
Selecting one of the labels at the top such as date reorganizes orders and selecting it can reorganizes it the opposite direction indicated by a small grey arrow by the label (I currently have no orders so can not see how they are displayed/function).

6.3 Connect With Facebook
http://www.degreetart.com/user/3010/edit/fbconnect?destination=control-panel
Does not currently work

7.0 Shopping Basket
http://www.degreetart.com/cart

| 7.1 Basket Navigator | Options to continue shopping, update cart (which is automatically selected to begin with) and delivery calculator | Buyers

| 7.2 Basket Summary | Displays small image of artwork selected to purchase next to details of title, medium and size which sits next to options to remove, change quantity and the price with a subtotal before delivery underneath | Buyers

| 7.3 Delivery Calculator | A small box that opens on top of the page when selected where it asks for address details of country and state/province from drop down boxes and a postcode that must be typed in, all are required fields with a calculate button at the bottom. | Buyers

| 7.4 Payment Options | Shows options for using a coupon next to three payment options of "Checkout" "Finance" and "Reserve Art" with checkout opening a page to complete the action and the other two options opening a box on the page to select options and fill in details to complete actions | Buyers

May not be necessary to have 'continue shopping located in this bar and delivery calculator could be positioned underneath the basket summary.

| 7.1 Basket Navigator | Options to continue shopping, update cart (which is automatically selected to begin with) and delivery calculator | Buyers

| 7.2 Basket Summary | Displays small image of artwork selected to purchase next to details of title, medium and size which sits next to options to remove, change quantity and the price with a subtotal before delivery underneath | Buyers

| 7.3 Delivery Calculator | A small box that opens on top of the page when selected where it asks for address details of country and state/province from drop down boxes and a postcode that must be typed in, all are required fields with a calculate button at the bottom. | Buyers

| 7.4 Payment Options | Shows options for using a coupon next to three payment options of "Checkout" "Finance" and "Reserve Art" with checkout opening a page to complete the action and the other two options opening a box on the page to select options and fill in details to complete actions | Buyers

Small image of artwork can be selected to take the user to a dedicated page along with the title, medium and size are written in plain text. Remove can be selected to remove the piece and update the basket. Quantity is entered by typing in a small box and the price is written in plain text. The subtotal price is written larger in a black bar underneath in plain pink text.

Small image of artwork can be selected to take the user to a dedicated page along with the title, medium and size are written in plain text. Remove can be selected to remove the piece and update the basket. Quantity is entered by typing in a small box and the price is written in plain text. The subtotal price is written larger in a black bar underneath in plain pink text.

The small box appears in the middle of the page and scrolls with the page details are filled on drop down boxes and a small box for postcode that must be typed in. Selecting the calculate button brings up options underneath of different delivery methods with their own prices of which one must be selected. The three options are collect from gallery, country priority and country 7 days.

Coupon code is filled in a text box with a text button to apply next to it. The three payment options are in bright coloured buttons. "Checkout" opens a page which summaries what is being bought at the top with 9 sections to fill in by the buyer (Customer information, billing information, delivery information, shipping cost, certificate discount, coupon discount, payment method, order comments and feedback) each section is hidden apart from the title which once selected opens forms that need to be filled in. "Finance" brings up a box on the page with finance options to select from drop down options and once an option is selected details are displayed with in the box with a button to Apply at the bottom which opens a 3rd party website which deals with the application "Reserve art" opens a small box with details to fill in however this option is currently not working properly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Wish List Settings</td>
<td>Displays a list of selected pieces with an image of the artwork, title, options to remove a piece, select how many you want, how many you have and quantity and a button to add to cart with total price of quantity of pieces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Wish List Items</td>
<td>Shows average delivery times with in the UK and internationally with average shipping costs to different parts of the world. A related pages section sits on the side of the page linking to other useful pages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Delivery Policy</td>
<td>This page focuses on guaranteeing buyers that they can return a piece they have bought. The page also outlines the terms and conditions in which they can return a piece with instructions of how to return artwork as well as the address to return to and to resolve other issues such as receiving the wrong piece of art work or canceling an order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Return Policy</td>
<td>Outlines the terms and conditions when agreeing to a privacy policy, including information that is collected, how it is used, control of your password, security and third part advertisers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Privacy Policy</td>
<td>Describes terms and conditions for the site including, Privacy Policy, Intellectual Property, Software and Content, DegreeArt.com Community Areas, Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7 Site Map <a href="http://www.degreeart.com/sitemap">http://www.degreeart.com/sitemap</a></td>
<td>Outlines the structure of the site with main section, pages and sub-pages with links to each part of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text links to sections, pages and sub-pages with search sections informing how many pieces of art work are in each section.

A couple of images are missing from the page. Could have a clearer indication that commissions are done by calling Degree Art.

| 9.8 Commission Art [http://www.degreeart.com/commission-art](http://www.degreeart.com/commission-art) | Describes what the benefits is for a buyer to commission a piece of art work with details of how to start a commission and the payment structure and some examples of art work that have been commissioned. | Buyers | Degree Art |

Made up of flat text and images as commissioning a piece is done almost entirely off line.

| 9.9 Our Services [http://www.degreeart.com/services](http://www.degreeart.com/services) | Shows the range of services that Degree Art offers including starting/adding to your collection, art & interior design consultancy, commissioning art, art valuation, gallery hire, artists' websites, art insurance and framing art work | Buyers | Degree Art |

Each service is in its own small section with an image, a short description and a link to read/view more in a separate page.

Information could be organised better to be less overwhelming.

| 9.10 About Us [http://www.degreeart.com/our-services](http://www.degreeart.com/our-services) | Describes the background to the company, site and co-founders and what they are trying to achieve with an introduction to the rest of the staff. Displays Twitter feed for co-founders, some members of staff and a Degree Art Twitter feed. Also shows a brief description of services they offer to clients/buyers and artists. Pictures, email addresses and Linked-in info are given for co-founders, only pictures and email addresses are given for staff and just pictures given for board members. | Buyers + Artists | Degree Art |

A mixture of images and flat text make up most of the page and information for the site/company and members of staff with links to email addresses, Twitter and Linked-in accounts. A small scroll box for each featured Twitter feed is given. Each staff member is given a small/medium profile pic with their name, email address and position with board member having the same minus an email address.

Should be more detailed and graphically more engaging as it is an important process of the site/business structure. Link to the application form should stand out more.

| 9.11 Join Us - Artists [http://www.degreeart.com/join-us](http://www.degreeart.com/join-us) | A page with a description and a link for artists to apply to be represented by Degree Art. The link connects to an application form asks artists to fill in details about themselves, their education and their art. The ‘join us’ page also promotes the benefits of joining Degree Art with testimonials from artists. | Artists | Degree Art |

The join us page is mostly made up of flat text and images with a link to the application form for Degree Art. The application form is mostly made up of text boxes for artists to fill in asking about their background, education, social media sites, if they have sold art before and where and asks them to upload 3 examples of their work with a price, size and title.

Should be more detailed and graphically more engaging as it is an important process of the site/business structure. Link to the application form should stand out more.

| 9.12 Contemporary Collective [http://www.degreeart.com/c-contemporary-collective](http://www.degreeart.com/c-contemporary-collective) | Describes what contemporary collective is which showcases a selection of artists that have gained a certain level of success during their time at Degree Art and links to their profile on Degree Art | Buyers | Degree Art |

A short description in flat text of what the contemporary collective is with a list of artists underneath each with an image of a piece of their art work and their name which links to their profile. Currently the images of their art work connect to an empty page.

| 9.13 Execution Room [http://www.degreeart.com/execution-room](http://www.degreeart.com/execution-room) | Shows images of the exhibition space with in the Degree Art gallery explaining what it is used for with links to visit the gallery, see details of upcoming and previous exhibitions, hire the gallery or sign up for the newsletter. | Buyers + Artists | Degree Art |

Flat text and images describe the purpose and location of the exhibition space with a bar of 4 links in the centre of the page to 1. 'visit us' (the contact page) 2. ‘exhibition’: a list of digital flyers of exhibitions with an image, title, date, time, location and read more which connects to a page dedicated to describing the exhibition, 3. ‘gallery hire’ - a page that details the cost, length and location of the gallery to hire with images of the gallery and its floor plan (currently not loading) and 4. ‘join us’ which links to a page that requests details for a user to sign up to a newsletter with text and drop down boxes asking for name, email, address, telephone number, where you heard ‘about us’ and what you would like to receive.

Confusing to see the purpose of the page as ‘visit us’ replicates the contact page and ‘join us’ is promoting the newsletter and has little to do with the gallery space.
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| 9.14 Links  
http://www.degreeart.com/links | A list of related and useful links to other sites that are part of the art world with descriptions summarising the site/company it links to including exhibitions, framing, charities, gallery hire, jobs and insurance | Buyers + Artists | Degree Art | A list of sites/companies with their logo down the left side organised in to different sections with a title and flat text description of the site next to each logo. Logos and titles of links connect to the relevant site. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9.15 Blog  
http://www.degreeart.com/knowledge | A list of previous and current articles written by Degree Art with links to find stories based on topic | Buyers + Artists | Degree Art | A list of blog articles with an image, title and intro for each article which can be selected to read more in its own dedicated page. To the left side are links to different articles based on categories, recent posts and comments |
Develop Wireframes / Sketches for prototype

Artellite-wireframes-2

Notes

1.0 An artwork image will fill the homepage background. Like Dropbox, this will be interchangeable and updated regularly to make the screen, which is sparse on content, more engaging. In the research it was found that users tend to bounce straight to the placeholder to entice users to complete the on-boarding process (form submission often creates resistance and a high drop-off rate).

Artellite-wireframes-2

Notes

1.0 This notification will pop up once the email address has been entered.

2.0 PLEASE NOTE: The Buyers’ account will not be developed until the next phase of the project. However, to design a well-integrated site, the wireframes and information architecture include this proposed area.
Notes

1. Login button is active and form fields appear inline, below the button.

2. The cross button deletes the artwork from the orders list. The Order Summary will automatically refresh to reflect the changes.

3. If the user has a Google account and accessing the website via Chrome, their Google profile image will populate here. To change or add one, the user can click on the upload link. On tap (2.1), a modal window will appear (2.2) to browse computer files.

4. Choose Profile Image

5. Upload

6. Browse photos

7. Place Order
Notes

1.0 The purpose of a profile image is to help artists and galleries identify who’s buying their artwork. Users rated this as very important in the purchasing process.

2.0 Buyers’ homepage dashboard is populated with recently viewed artworks which haven’t been formally saved as a wish list or as ‘followed’. This is to remind users of their recent (art) journey and experiences.

3.0 User ratings of paintings – only available once logged in. Users disliked Facebook ‘liking’ artworks as it was perceived to “cheapen” the presentation. Our ‘Love’ feature needs to differentiate aesthetically and interactively.

4.0 Messaging feature accessed via drop down buttons. This will notify users of purchase order confirmations and delivery details.

On first entering the site and having clicked on ‘I am a buyer’, users (buyers) are directed straight to Manage / Edit Profile to set up their account details. ‘You’ are the only necessary field to complete.

Modal window would have a scroll bar to reveal more styles / genres.

Mobile version would have a scroll bar to reveal more styles / genres.
1. Users can opt to save card details when making a purchase. If they wish to edit these, they can access their profile.

2. Address fields automatically populate if the user searches by postcode. Otherwise, they can enter the details manually.
Notes
1. By Default the Purchase History is in date order - most recent at the top with the drop down menu for the current year active.

Notes
1. By Default the Wish List is in date order. The cross removes the wish list items from the users Wish List.
Notes

1.0 Artist profile image, by default, is linked to their Gmail account image (front end). On tap, this can be edited/changed to an alternate image, or art work thumbnail by example.

2.0 Analytics Summary drop down is active meaning the artist's sales, profile and artwork ratings at a glance. A third drop down menu of these statistics can be seen via the dashboard analytics tab (2.1). 3.0 also links to the Analytics tab on the front end.

3.0 PLEASE NOTE: Artellite's FAS meeting as the FAS Guide has been changed to 'Best Practice Guide' and all additional menu categories from FAS have been changed to AFFiliates, which is the management of users' affiliated Galleries and Exhibitions. This is fundamental to the functionality of the dashboard system. A quick look at the user's affiliations can also be seen on the right navigation panel, the links replace the user in that contract in the Affiliations Page.

4.0 Plus sign button is to add additional meta tags. We are going to explore the possibility of users adding meta tags to artist's artworks. This would need to be controlled and therefore the administration would be difficult to make easy for the artists. PLEASE NOTE! We are not recommend this.

5.0 This shows the number of 'love' ratings. The hand icon is currently in editing. From a link to an image (highly voted) through to a translucent heart (poorly voted).

6.0 This links to the first real view of the user's website (the artist's gallery or organisations satellite database view).

Please tell us a little about yourself to get started

Your content

Artellite-wireframes-2
Global Logged In Artist

Notes

1.0 On first entering the site and having clicked on I am an artist / user (profile) the users are directed straight to Manage / Edit Profile to set up their account details.

2.0 Once their profile is complete and live, artist will be alerted to orders via the Notifications drop down (see next page details). To manage the order the user can click on the link (2.1 wireframe for activated state).
Notes

1.0 Shows activated Order Notification message (1.1)

2.0 The order is pending because the artist has either:
   - ticked 'Authorise Purchase' when the content was uploaded (see 5.0 on next wireframe). This allows the artist to research the buyer's credentials before authorising the purchase or, if it is a commission, the artist would need to agree to taking it on.

1.0 Once users have uploaded an artwork a preview will be
   visible in the image thumbnail

2.0 Artists can opt for purchase authorisation, which means the transaction needs to be approved (by them) prior to a successful sale. Research indicated that Artists and Galleries felt it was important to research buyers' backgrounds. Pending approvals appear in Notifications (2.1)

1.0 Artists can opt for purchase authorisation, which means the transaction needs to be approved (by them) prior to a successful sale. Research indicated that Artists and Galleries felt it was important to research buyers' backgrounds. Pending approvals appear in Notifications (2.1)
Notes

1.0  Formally PR Guides, Artellite will create persona specific user guides to help users manage and navigate the site area effectively (1.1. PR advice is a possibility TBC.

Persona specific content to be generated by Artellite. Disseminate information into categories.
### Artellite-wireframes-2
Global Logged In Artist 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist's Name</th>
<th>Galleries who represent you</th>
<th>Add new Gallery</th>
<th>Affiliations pending the Gallery's approval</th>
<th>Approved Affiliations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Search Galleries</td>
<td>A Gallery</td>
<td>Message Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add or Cancel</td>
<td>B Gallery</td>
<td>Message Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C Gallery</td>
<td>Message Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D Gallery</td>
<td>Message Gallery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Title: Artellite-wireframes-2
Creator: Suzy Willis
Updated: Tue Apr 15 2014
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Artellite-wireframes-2
Global Logged In Gallery / Organisation 2.0

Artellite user guides to help you manage your website

Persona specific content to be generated by Artellite.
Distribute information into categories.

Title: Artellite-wireframes-2  /  Creator: Suzy Willis  /  Modified: Tue Apr 15 2014
Notes

1.0  Galleries do not need to obtain confirmation form Artists to create an affiliation (unlike visa versa where artist's gallery affiliations pend until approval).

3.0  By default, first 10 results are shown.

Notes

1.0  Actual tags use by order of popularity (according to surveyed needs).

3.0  Meta tag are input by the artist when uploading new artworks - to indicate style/genre attributes. They appear in the corner of each artwork (2.1) and show how many uploads share that tag.

3.0  Red dots indicate items that have sold in the series. Artists' can choose whether sold items are displayed in their account settings but research showed it was important to showcase a contextual/developmental series together.

4.0  Pricing is not revealed (on the homepage). Research indicated that explicit price trapped users disengagement from the artworks. Users also wanted a 'vivid colourful' pictorial homepage that users could scrolling with little text. Only when they click on item's should detailed short content be shown.
Notes

1.0 Sketchbook page verified More link (2.1 on previous wireframe). This give custom and high-end collectors an opportunity to connect more deeply with the artwork/series. Research indicated that high-end collectors felt it was important to build a connection.

3.8 Click cross to close the page and return to previous Artwork Page.
Notes

1.0 The artist's blog content sits in a four column grid and populates in order of the blog date. Each item links to content on the artist's 'Artwork Gallery' or 'Exhibitions' category pages.

2.0 Users can share a selected blog entry via Twitter/Facebook or email. On tap, a module window will appear where users can select which channel to send via.

3.0 Template copy which can be edited by users.
The blog content is in a four column grid and populates according to blog date. Each item links to content on the Artist or Exhibitions category pages - and the gallery can choose between large, medium and small blog thumbnails.
Notes

1.0 Artist are in date order according to the latest uploaded artwork. This incentivises artist to keep updating their portfolio to appear higher on the list and also keeps the page refreshed (albeit unsearchable).

2.0 Drop-down listing represented artists in alphabetical order.
Artellite-wireframes-2

Notes

1.0 Exhibitions are populated in date order. Video and image content can be uploaded, with a summary of the event.
Notes

1.0 Link to Google Maps
Introduction to Content-Based Image Retrieval

In general terms, ‘content based retrieval’ is distinguished from standard retrieval operations, by the nature of the search term. First, consider a text-based example, rather than the image-based example. We then move on to consider visual media, the standard types of search and retrieval, and relevant issues and the possible applications to the Artellite project.

In Section 2, the types of tags and tagging activities are reviewed, and in Section 3 the various applications of CBIR for these processes are considered. Three applications in particular are selected for further investigations: ‘searching for similar’, ‘searching for tags’, and ‘searching for duplicates’. These are discussed in Sections 4, 5 and 6. Section 7 respectively. The conclusion is in Section 8.

Also of note are four Appendices:

**Content-based retrieval: written media**

A book has several attributes that are external to its text: the title, author name(s), publisher, date, ISBN, etc.. Keywords and the divisions and sections of a classification may also be applied. All of these may be included in a query to retrieve one or more books stored in a collection: this would be called a standard retrieval process. However, the actual text of the book – the content of the book – may also be searched as part of the retrieval process. For example, the query can consist of text, e.g. “It is a truth universally acknowledged” and the result of this query will be those books in the collection that contain this phrase (in this example, both ‘Pride and Prejudice’, and also numerous books on literary criticism). Some observations on this ‘content-based text retrieval’ can be made, with comparisons made in the image domain as applicable:

i) There are two fundamentally different purposes for the retrieval: searching for a single item, or ‘browsing’ to discover similar items. This applies to all types of query, content-based or not, and using text, image or a combination.

ii) For text searches, the search term would normally be one or more phrases – rarely the entire text. For image searches it is typical for the search term to be the entire image.

iii) A very common use of content-based text retrieval is ‘web search’, e.g. google. Web search for image retrieval is less common, but does exist.

iv) The evaluation of search performance is well-documented. The typical methodology is to ask for a ranked list of retrieval items and to quote how many ‘correct’ items were in the first 1, 5, 10 etc items in the list.
**Content-based retrieval: visual media**

Probe and gallery (target set)

Identical and similar

Definition of similar

In image-based search, it is common to call the database of images ‘the gallery’ and the image used as part of the search is called ‘the probe’.

There are variations of the attributes of the probe that are important:

i) The quality of the probe image: geometric, focus and chromatic distortions

ii) The case of the probe being a fragment of the original (rather than the whole)

And there are also important variations on the definition of similarity:

A. Similarity of layout (e.g. landscape, configuration of people)

B. Similarity of dominant colours (e.g. particular shades of pastel colours)

C. Similarity of texture (e.g. oils)

D. Similarity of semantics (e.g. man with umbrella in street)

Furthermore there are also the contextual search terms, e.g. artist, date, title, tags. These could also be included, along with A-D above, in some overall ‘recipe’ for similarity, or else a system could include controls to enable or remove each of the above attributes. Finally, there is the potential to include ‘learning by example’, e.g. an interactive process in which the user affirms some search results, and declines others, and thereby modifies the algorithm for selecting subsequent examples.
Tags and Tagging

There is a range of information, about works of art, that enables these works to be found in searches by users. Some of this information is ‘about the content’ while other aspects are contextual, e.g. artist name, year of creation, and price.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual</strong></td>
<td>Tagged by artist or expert</td>
<td>Artist name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date of creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frame details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semantic</strong></td>
<td>Tagged by experts (or possibly the crowd)</td>
<td>Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inspired Artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“gap”</strong></td>
<td>Automatically generated</td>
<td>Feature vectors for layout comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feature vectors for colour distribution comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feature vectors for texture comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational</strong></td>
<td>Automatically generated</td>
<td>List of other artworks that other users also viewed / liked / bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of other artworks with similar layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of other artworks with similar colour distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of other artworks with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1:

Applications of CBIR in Artellite

For Artellite, there are several applications of CBIR that are relevant. These can be grouped into actions driven by the following:

- ‘the buyer’ (i.e. a potential customer, using the website to browse or search)
- ‘the artist’ (i.e. an artist or their representative, uploading and tagging their works made available through the website)
The following sections present possible applications of CBIR for the Artellite scenario. A discussion of business priorities and technical constraints follows in Section 0; the items presented in bold are those which were considered to be the priority, in the light of this discussion.

**CBIR for the Buyer**

Application 1) Buyer’s search for **specific** item within Artellite content area, using *user-supplied* probe. (They are searching for a **specific** work of art, of which they have a photo/URL)

Application 2) Buyer’s search for **similar** items within Artellite content areas, using *user-supplied* probe (They have an example of the art, and they are seeking **similar** works)

Application 3) **Buyer’s search for similar items within Artellite, using a Artellite probe. In other words, they find an example of the art on Artellite; they seek similar items.**

Application 4) Buyer’s search for items within Artellite, using a Artellite probe, using a specific definition of similarity (e.g. the same size, the same colours, the same textures, the same topic).

Application 5) Buyer’s search for **similar** items within Artellite content areas, using *semantic keywords* that describe what they are looking for, *e.g.* “sunset”, “boat”, “father and son”.

Application 6) Buyer ‘draws a sketch’ that indicates the main features of the item they are looking for, and the system presents works of art that are similar to this sketch

**CBIR for the Artist**

Application 7) Artist is tagging their own work: they are provided with ‘similar’ works of art, to help them with the tagging process. within Artellite using (their own) Artellite probe. (Artist is tagging own work and is looking for similar examples, to understand what tags could be used)

Application 8) **Artist is tagging their own work: they are automatically presented with a list of possible tagging terms that describe the art, the art style or movement, or names of (famous) artists that may provide helpful associations for the buyer.**
CBIR for Administrators

Application 9) Artellite Administrators are send an alert if the same work of art appears in multiple places across the different sites encompassed by the site. (This would possibly indicate one of several possible problems, such as duplicate entries, conflicting contractual arrangements between galleries and an artist, or plagiarism).

Priorities and constraints

Artist Tagging. In meetings with the business owners it was made clear that the first business priority is to encourage Artists to tag their work with appropriate keywords and a compelling narrative. Any technology that nudges them towards this goal was considered useful. Thus, Application 7) and Application 8) are considered for this role. Application 7) is considered less of a priority, for two reasons. Firstly it was considered that the best type of ‘tagged artwork’ example to present to the Artist, are cases in which the tagging and description is particularly creative and apt. It is not so important that these examples have to be similar. Secondly, it is debatable whether the retrieval accuracy of the CBIR would be sufficient to make this process feasible: similarity is partly in the eye of the beholder, and Artists are a special set of ‘beholders’, and it would be difficult to emulate their judgement.

Application (7), on the other hand, provides an alternative form of ‘nudge’ that they may find acceptable. It may be used to suggest tags for their work that the Artist can either accept or decline; it avoids the ‘blank sheet’ syndrome of a large list of choices that must then be selected. This is then considered as meriting further investigation.

Business Constraints. Looking at the ‘buyer-driven’ processes, we see a number of methods for suggesting similar artwork, based on their current (or previous?) selections. However, an important consideration is the business interests served by the Artellite system, namely the Artists, Galleries and Arts Organisations. In discussions it was made clear that each of the websites representing these entities should only display ‘similar’ works of art that are for sale from that same website.

Thus, a ‘search by similarity’ would be of limited value for an Artist’s website, and of somewhat limited value for a smaller Gallery, because the size of the collection would permit the Buyer to discover these works without CBIR technology. For larger Galleries, and for Arts Organizations, there is more value in drawing the Buyer’s attention to similar works of art, because it increases the efficiency of the Buyers’ interaction with a large set of paintings, and thereby increases the prospect of completing a sale.

User Experience Constraints. There has to be realistic expectations about the extent to which the existing User Experience (for the Buyer) can be adapted, to accommodate an interaction with CBIR technology. A good example from history is the development of user interfaces for internet search engines. Initially, these presented sophisticated forms through which the user was invited to provide detailed information about their research
requirements. At about the turn of the century, these were transformed into the iconic single search box from Google. Users are now accustomed to this level of simplicity and so this makes it more difficult to introduce more complex variants on search behaviour unless there is a compelling reason to provide this additional information, e.g. flight bookings.

As such, the more sophisticated search and retrieval interfaces must be assessed on a cost-benefit basis, questioning the extent to which they add value to the on-line business, assessed against the development cost and also the risk of putting off casual users. For this reason, Application 3) is selected as the most realistic prospect for the business.

Technology Constraints. There are several technological constraints:

- There is still a significant “semantic gap” that exists between the raw representation and ‘meaningful interpretation’ of paintings. Thus, while it is possible to extract some semantic information, such as the number and location of people or faces in the scene, more general inferences are error-prone and difficult to automate.

Finally, the identification of duplicate images (is selected as something to also keep in focus, as it provides a capability with several possible uses in addition to those listed in the description. i) A variation on the proposal to ‘to look for identical images’ is to automatically perform this search elsewhere on the web, i.e. to locate publications of this artwork elsewhere. This functionality may be useful both to promote and coordinate with existing third-party marketing activities, but also to identify cases where artists and/or galleries may be in breach of their agreements with Artellite. Another example: it could enable a service for an artist upload a zip file of images and they could be informed which of these are currently / previously for sale through Artellite. Or a ‘Buyer’ (member of the public) could upload an image to see where and when this image was originally sold. However, but it hasn’t actually been requested by anybody yet, so it seems more like ‘technology-push’ rather than ‘business-pull’.

Priority Applications for CBIR

The following Applications of CBIR are selected for further investigation

a) ‘Search for similar’ artwork, for the browsing buyer
b) ‘Search for Tags’, for the uploading artist
c) ‘Search for Duplicates’, primarily for the Artellite administrator.

These are each considered in the following sections.

‘Search for similar’: Implementation Options

This is a standard problem for signal processing scientists, and so there are a number of solutions proposed. Nevertheless, it may be argued that the problem is under-defined, as there is no one definition of what is meant by ‘similarity’. Broadly, there are four types of implementation option:
1) Create and manage an implementation directly from source code, for example using source code derived from published methods, such as [3,4,5].

2) Use a software library, with associated API, to index the target set and perform the search. An example is the Lire software package [7].

3) Use a web service, with associated API, to perform the search. It can be noted that the indexing of target set is typically the responsibility of the web service provider. Some examples of web services are listed below.

4) Use a web tool to perform the search by designing a program to emulate the behaviour of a user. An example scenario is the use of a google image search from within a script designed to automatically process the results. (Likewise, the indexing of target set is typically the responsibility of the web service provider) However, this option is not strictly legal, in that the web tools were not designed for this purpose and so it may violate the terms of use agreement for the web tool.

A useful constraint for this application of CBIR is that there is a relatively closed target set: all images hosted by Artellite. While this set will continue to grow daily, two options remain feasible:

i) Use an internally hosted solution (such as (1) or (2), above) that will maintain responsibility for indexing all content

ii) Use an externally hosted solution that is free up to a certain usage level, and paid-for thereafter. For example, the Google Custom Search license permits 100 free searches per day. Thereafter a paid-for license must be used.

'Search for tags': Implementation Options

This ‘search for tags’ is a non-standard problem definition. However it has been identified as potentially of value to the Artellite. The use-case that is foreseen is as follows:

a) Artist uploads image depicting work of art

b) The image is analysed and as a result keywords are suggested to the Artist. These keywords are intended to invoke helpful association for the buyer, such as Art Movement (‘impressionist’, ‘cubist’, ‘modernist’, etc) and Artists (‘Picasso’, ‘Monet’, ‘Klimt’ etc).

c) The Artist accepts or deletes these tags, as appropriate. The Artist may be prompted to further edit the categories directly using the standard existing tools provided by Artellite.

d) The keywords as used in the normal way as part of the presentation of content to the Buyer

As discussed previously, it is non-trivial to automatically assign these keywords with sufficient reliability to be useful. One option it is proposed to investigate is to use
perform a similarity search on a third party websites and use the resulting URLs to characterise the work of art to be uploaded. For example, images on the wikiart site have the artist in the URL:
http://www.wikiart.org/en/ioannis-altamouras/1877
If a lookup relationship between artists and art movements can be created, then the top $n$ search results from a given site can be used to ‘vote’ for the genre.

‘Search for duplicates’: Implementation Options

Detecting identical Artwork
Example papers for detecting identical images are given as [1] and [2]. The standard constraints on performance are:
- Differences of colour and scale
- Cropped images. Some may then consider this a ‘different image’ but the detection of common sub-images is important (though increasing in difficulty with decreasing sub-image size)

Workflow for externally hosted CBIR
It is suggested that the following processing stages can be incorporated into the overall system architecture:

Adding artwork to the hub
This is the stage in which the image analysis takes place:
- The analysis could use a third party resource (e.g. images.google.com), a separate Artellite resource (mediated by http or a web service), or it could be facilitated by a custom drupal module that completes the analysis on the same server.
- In any case, it is proposed that the appropriate output from this module is a list of ‘similar’ artwork, ordered by rank, and referenced using some primary identifier for each piece of artwork.
- Note that this proposed output is different to the standard CBIR methodology. The standard methodology will output some ‘indexing meta-data’ that would be used to calculate similarity for arbitrary future input image. However, we do not need to design for arbitrary input, just for the range of art within artellite, and so there is an improvement in performance and simpler design can be achieved by pre-calculating the similar pictures to each item of art
- Note that similarity is generally agreed to be commutative, i.e. if A is similar to B then B is similar to A, and if A is added to the hub then the list of similar artwork for B will also need to be updated.
- It is proposed to complete the calculation similarity for ALL items of art included in the hub, i.e. by all artists, even though in general there will be constraints on which similar matches are displayed (e.g. not from competing galleries). This is because these constraints will change over time, e.g. if several galleries join an ‘arts organization’, items will be sold.
Search for similar art

Since the hard work has been done at the artwork ingestion stage, at this stage we simply require an SQL query to obtain a list IDs for similar art, ranked by similarity.
- An important component to this stage is that the similarity results are filtered so that only ‘authorized items’ are included (i.e. artwork displayed by the same artist/gallery/arts organization, depending on which site the buyer is looking at)

Updating database

The system must accommodate items that are either completely removed from the database, or else sold (there seems to be little point in directing buyers to works of art that have already been sold.

Conclusion

References

Appendix A: Using Google Search for Buyer ‘Search by Similarity’

Google search provides good implementations of both identity and similarity search. For a manual demonstration, navigate to images.google.com and click on the camera icon. A ‘probe’ (search) image can be uploaded or specified via URL. The returned search is separated into identity and similarity results. This can be restricted using the standard google search syntax, e.g. “site:Artellite.com” to look only in the Artellite website. Two examples of this search are given below:

**Figure 1:** Results obtained when using google to select similar images within the Artellite website, by providing a link to the top (probe) image. The search query URL for this is provided below:

[URL provided for Figure 1]
Figure 2: a second search by image similarity, restricted to the Artellite website

Appendix B: Investigation into use of CBIR for automatic tagging

In this section, experiments are reported to assess the feasibility of suggesting labels to the artist uploading their work. Two categories of label are suggested: art movements (such as modernism, impressionism, realism, etc), and artists (such as Cezanne, Chagall, Klee, Klimt etc).

Two approaches to implement the CBIR are suggested:

1) Use an open source CBIR resource such as LIRE (http://www.lire-project.net/)

2) Use the google image retrieval capability.

The first approach has been implemented; the results are not yet at a level that demonstrates that it is feasible, although some further configuration of the software may result in improved performance. The second approach is also being implemented, and these results will be included in the report when available. Below, the experiments to date are described.

B.1 Data Collection

Examples of the following categories of painting were collected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Number of examples</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Number of Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cezanne</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cubist</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagall</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Deco</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKooning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Expressionist</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klee</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fauvism</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klimt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Impressionist</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monet</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Modernist</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picasso</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pointillist</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Realist</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Suprematist</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanGogh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The methodology for collection of examples was to use google image search, using the category name following by ‘painting’, and to then collect examples in rank order as returned by the search engine, discarding duplicates and erroneous results (such as collages of multiple paintings and pictures of the artist).
Examples of ‘Suprematist’ category | Examples of ‘Pointillist’ category

B.2 Automatic tags for ‘artist’ or ‘movement’

The ‘Lire’ software was used to give some indication of the extent to which open source software could successfully group together works of art by the same artist, or labelled to be in the same art movement.

This software allows a folder of images (and its subfolders) to be indexed, and used as a gallery for retrieval experiments. It supports the following sets of features: Colour Histograms, Edge Histograms, Tamura Texture Features, Gabor Texture Features, JPEG co-efficients, SURF Features, Joint Histograms, and Luminence Layout.

1. Search for ‘Suprematist’ work. The search term (‘probe’) is the top left image, and the remaining five images are retrieved by the software. Three out of 5 are the correct category.
2. Search using a ‘Deco’ sample

3. Search using a ‘De Kooning’ sample. The search term (‘probe’) is the top left image, and the remaining five images are retrieved by the software. Two out of 5 are the correct category.
4. Search using a ‘Turner’ example. The search term (‘probe’) is the top left image, and the remaining five images are retrieved by the software. Two out of 5 are the correct category.

The above results are indicative of the general level of accuracy achieved. This is not yet sufficient to implement an automated suggestion of categories. Work continues on further experiments to improve the rate at which the correct category is retrieved. This includes analysis on black and white version of the artwork (to remove the sensitivity to irrelevant variations in colours), and on-line tools such as google.
Appendix C: Survey of Art Search Engines

INTRODUCTION

This is a preliminary review of existing image retrieval search engines, looking at their strengths and weaknesses and how they try to overcome the "semantic gap"; that is the rich returns expected by users and the low level semantics machines can actually compute.

Using words to search for images embeds a permanent semantic gap by design, but content based image retrieval (CBIR), is one way of overcoming this. CBIR is query by image content and is most often achieved by the application of computer vision techniques to the problem of the semantic gap when searching for digital images in large databases.

In image retrieval, semantics are divided into high-level and low-level. Low level semantics are color, texture, shape and spatial layout. In this level, there are two categories one is the semantics type where images are organized by type like landscape, photography or clipart. The other one is Object Composition, like a sunsets or beach scene [11].

High level is the use of key words or phrases. This level is also divided into two categories, abstract semantics (people talking) and detailed semantics (detailed description of a picture).

Cox stated in the Bayesian Image Retrieval System Pic hunter that searches can be classified into three categories. [2]

The first one is the OPEN-ENDED SEARCH or Browsing. In this category users search the database without a specific goal in mind. The user will start looking for something vague and navigate through various option [2].

The second is the CATEGORY SEARCH. This search is presented when the user looks for images that belong to a certain category. They aimed to find a similar image from that specific category. [2]

The third category is TARGET SEARCH. This aimed search is when the user is looking for a specific image. To users that do not know the title or the author of what are they looking for, but they have a mental image of what they want. They had seen the image.

There are three types of Users based on their Intentions or Aims. The first one is the BROWSER is the user that has a no clear image about what they want. This user is wondering about finding something interesting.

Then is the SURFER is the one that has a moderate clarity of the end-goal. This search may lead to subsequent searches until they find out what they want. Last is the SEARCHER who is clear about what they are looking for [11].

Google Image Search starts with key words. If the user wants to narrow the results, they can add content-based features eg image size, color etc.
Search Images by Metadata

This is a descriptive retrieval method where text is added to images as meta-data in order to be found. This data could be technical information as the date of creation, resolution, or a semantic description about the content of the image. [8]

There are two problems with this method. Number one is adding a manual way the textual meta-data to all the images. The second problem is the semantics for those who enter the data and the ones who are looking for the image. This is a high-level of semantics in image retrieval, meaning that there is a bigger risk to have a wide semantic gap.

All of the engines use the search box where the user types the query of what they are looking for, using keywords.

The types of search platforms that uses this retrieval usually because it works better are by categories or open-ended. Perfect for the Surfer or Browse users that are looking around or want something general. They are just wondering around without a specific aim. This user does not know what they are looking for, so the software tells them what they have. They can browse and select one from 30 to 40 categories to explore. Usually these categories are defined by developers to help the software organize the stock of images.

The good thing about this search engines platforms is that some of them are tag by people making the keywords more accurate and saving time for someone to tag it. On the other hand, images that are not tag or organize in the correct categories are lost in a black hole where nobody will find them.

These categories always depends on the infor-

Search By Category

User type: Browser and Surfer.
Search Type: Category or Open-ended
Search These categories are predefined by the software developer.

Weakness:
Everyone can add images that are why there are a lot of bad quality in images.
There is no content-based image retrieval.

Absence of filter to narrow the results.
The results are not presented in order nor by type nor by date or relevance.

Strengths:
The ones that tags images are common persons. Time saving for developers to add the meta-data.
Dribbler Color Tool

1. User selects a Color from a general scheme.
2. Users can modify the color by selecting the hue or typing the hex number of the color.
3. Modify the search by choosing how similar other colors in the image results are going to be.
4. Add the amount of color percent in each image.

Information that the platform presents. For example, Behance will present images related to projects from professional designers and their categories will be different to the ones in Flickr. Depending on the aim, the user will choose the platform which is most convenient to find the image we would like to use.

Some of this Platforms are Pinterest, Instagram, Picasa, Dribbler, Behance, Flickr. Most of them only use keywords, but others like Dribbler and Behance add filters to narrow the results with their content.

Content-Based Image Retrieval (CBIR)

In addition to keywords, images have more elements, in semantics are those with low-level. This means that with the content here has a small percent to present a semantic gap. Content-Based Image Retrieval uses the combination of keywords and index terms.[9]

The common ground for Content-Based Image retrieval is a series of signatures or features for each image, colors, shapes, textures or other information derived by the image.

Content-Based Image Retrievals systems analyse an image and extract visual features, without assigning any semantic meaning to them.

Some examples of this platforms are Corbis and iStockPhotos. These websites are large photo stocks that use both keywords and other elements from the image to have an advanced search.

Some filters based on CBIR that helps narrow the results are by color, by size, by composition, or type of image.

BYCOLOR

The engines that use color to narrow results presents just a few of them, from 8 to 12 different colors. One of the websites that work excellent in searching images by color is the one used in Dribbler. First the search starts from general color scheme where the user selects a color between 28 different colors. If the search needs a specific
color, the user can add the value of the HEX color number. Another feature of this tool is to modify the results by selecting a percent of variance they want from other colors in the image. For example if a user wants the image present different colors for more contrast, in that case the user will apply select 100% variance. Another element that makes the search even better is to add the percent of color in the image the user wants.

**BY SPACE**

CopySpace consists of an empty space. In some cases the position of the camera and the elements inside the image. A novelty feature that iStockPhotos has a tool where the user can select the space they want their copy or text needs to be. CopySpace is the name of this tool. It is an interactive tool where a canvas is divided into 9 squares. Users select the squares where he wants a free space to add some text.

**Feedback Retrieval**

Feedback Retrieval is when the user make relevant an image and the system will return results based on the user action.

In Corbis images and iStockPhotos there is a feature where the user can find more images according to the one from a previous query. “More like this image” makes the results more accurate according to what the user was looking for.

**iStockPhoto**

iStockPhoto is a site to look for royalty-free stock photos. This site sells photography and illustrations to use in advertising, editorial or others.

**User type: Searcher**

**Search Type: Category or Target**

In this engine, they employ meta-data and content-based image retrieval to generate better results. Some of the filters are:

- By type (photos, illustrations or video), Price, License type,
- By Shape of Layout (Horizontal, Vertical or Square), CopySpace, Size (K, XXL or XXII) and Collections.

Other attributes are image with People or No People, the time when the image was added.

iStockPhotos manage 24 Categories
CORBIS IMAGES

Corbis is the complete website to find royalty-free images. This website is focus to help Searcher users with an aimed search.

Corbis use sets of filters to narrow the search with more accurate results. Some of the filters are by date added, type of license, by image attributes as type (photography, illustration), color and layout orientation. For compositions, the filter is divided by the layout and the Camera point of view.

This site is the only I had found that narrows results by people descriptions. It considers the gender, age, ethnicity and number of persons in the image.

Once the results are displayed the user can select one and search for similar images - “more images like this”. This feedback retrieval happens when the system display the results of a query and the user redefined those by selecting one they find close to what they where looking for, so the software will display similar results.

Another tool in Corbis is the use of key words to complement the query as NOT: to exclude elements, or as AND: to add more elements in the search.

The Advanced Search tool covers a search by the range of dates, Location, Photographer, Provider and resolution.

Weakness: It is an overwhelming amount of filters and options to narrow the search.
Image Retrieval in Museum and Galleries

The use of image retrieval is not use only in museums websites but also in art applications and education sites. Some of the sites I use to analyse are the TATE museum, wiki paintings, Google art project and art circles.

Images retrieval in museums and galleries always manage words to find a picture. Some of the filters that are included in the searches are the following:

Elements of a Painting:

Color, Size or Strokes
Categories: Style, Medium or Art Movement

Meta-Data:

By Author: Name, Genre, Nationality
Title of the Painting
Date of the Painting
Museum Location or Collection

Search engines assume that people know the name of the painting or the author, but that is not true. Only popular titles are memorized like the “Starry Night” of Van Gogh. When paintings names are “The Apple” or “UnTitle” makes difficult the quest. A problem to look by name of authors might have spelling troubles like Liechtenstein.

In the paper “A Sketching Game for Art History Instruction” present a sketch-based game for learning images [19]. They set Sketching as an exploratory design. Its been prove that sketching improves the memory. In the paper they discover that the composition of a painting has a visual impression in the user.
YourPaintings.com

YourPaintings.com is a project where everybody is invited to tag paintings from the public catalogue foundation.

This project is inspiring, but one weak point that presents is the data inserted is not being curated by a professional. Only People who are specialized in art should be able to tag the paintings.

Query by Visual Example (QVE)

The QVE (query by visual example) accepts a sketch roughly drawn by a user to retrieve the original image and the similar images. The system evaluates the similarity between the rough sketch, i.e. a visual example, and each of the image data in the database automatically.[7]

The user makes rough sketch the image (visual data) and the software looks for similar images in the database. The goal was to build a user-friendly interface.

These algorithms were tested in an experimental database system - ART MUSEUM( MULTimedia database with SEnsor of color and composition Upon the Matter of Art).

Their requirements are that users provide pictorial keys (rough sketches) to retrieve an image in a user-friendly manner. The system maps individual parts of the image data into abstracted representation. Use a powerful pattern recognition algorithms. The system not only use rough sketches from the user but also works with a photo or image.

One of the flaws I see with this system is that the user do not have to assign any key words or index terms for content retrieval.

People see sketching as a difficult task to accomplish. The learning experience to sketch with a mouse might take years to dominate it. I had seen people who have trouble in doing a simple drawing to explain their self, they always argue that they are not good artists. Making people "sketch" a Picasso or a Da Vinci is not suitable for an user friendly interaction.

Another one, users do not assign any key words. For the system to have a better communication, the user needs to explain what they have seen even if is not a perfect sketch. There are not perfect sketches so for the system to understand better the user can add key words to explain it.

The Pictorial Index: it is how the information is organized, so the software looks for an image based on the compositions. Integrates textual iconic database management system which supports the retrieval of iconic information by content.
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Appendix D: Designs for Visual Query by Example (VQE) Interface

The QVE (query by visual example) accepts a sketch roughly drawn by a user to retrieve the original image and the similar images. The system evaluates the similarity between the rough sketch, i.e. a visual example, and each of the image data in the database automatically.[7]

The user makes rough sketch the image (visual data) and the software looks for similar images in the database. The goal was to build a user-friendly interface.

These algorithms were tested in an experimental database system - ARTMUSEUM (MUltimedia database with SEnse of color and composition Upon the Matter of Art).

Their requirements are that users provide pictorial keys (rough sketches) to retrieve an image in a user-friendly manner. The system maps individual parts of the image data into abstracted representation. Use a powerful pattern recognition algorithms. The system not only use roughs sketches from the user but also works with a photo or image.

One of the flaws I see with this system is that the user do not have to assign any key words or index terms for content retrieval.

People see Sketching as a difficult task to accomplish. The learning experience to sketch with a mouse might take years to dominate it. I had seen people who have trouble in doing a simple drawing to explain their self, they always argue that they are not good artists. Making people “sketch” a Picasso or a Da Vinci is not suitable for an user friendly interaction.

Another one, users do not assign any key words. For the system to have a better communication, the user needs to explain what they had seen even if is not a perfect sketch. There are not perfect sketches so for the system to understand better the user can add key words to explain it.

The Pictorial Index: it is how the information is organized, so the software looks for an image based on the compositions. Integrates textual iconic database management system which supports the retrieval of iconic information by content.[7]
Design Templates

Artist Profile 1

Artist Profile 2

Artists Profile 3

Artists Profile 4
Artwork Page
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Text Page
Welcome to The Other Art Fair Shop.

A showcase of 100 of the best emerging artists, this is your opportunity to buy directly from artists before they gain gallery representation.

These artists have been carefully selected by our curators from across the UK, including Zena Woods, Cecilia Ercup, Helen Colony-Lambert, Yoko Woodhouse, Nana Nox, and artist Amber, founder of and director of the emerging gallery, Art and Industry. This unique experience allows you to choose from the very best emerging artists.

TOAF Home

WELCOME TO THE MAJOR SATELLITE EVENT DURING THE MOST IMPORTANT WEEK IN LONDON’S ART CALENDAR

Following the successful iteration of The Other Art Fair London, the gallery is proud to present The Other Art Fair London Satellite Event, a special preview of the best emerging artists from some of the most exciting contemporary art studios.

Collecting withFnzio, the art and design platform, and our partners, we are excited to present The Other Art Fair London Satellite Event. This event will showcase some of the most exciting emerging artists and will include an exhibition at our London gallery, opening on Saturday 11th May at 6PM.

The Other Artists

Meet The Artists: Helen Colony-Lambert, Yoko Woodhouse, Nana Nox, and Amber, founder of Art and Industry.

VIEW ALL ARTISTS

TESS McKECHNIE MARKS, EDICION DRURY, BLACK MAMBA
### Appendices

#### A. Art Organisation Questionnaire

[https://kwiksurveys.com/s.asp?sid=0quqoe45opk3dee276461](https://kwiksurveys.com/s.asp?sid=0quqoe45opk3dee276461)

**Art Organisations Background**

1. **Name of Organisation**

2. **How many years of experience does your organisation have?**
   - Less than a year
   - 2-4 years
   - 5 years or more

3. **How many Galleries do you work with?**
   - 1-9
   - 10-49
   - 50-100
   - more than 100

**Online Presence**

4. **Do you believe having an online presence will have a positive impact on your sales?**
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

5. **Would you like to invest in an ecommerce business for your organisation?**
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6) What will be the purpose of your Online presence?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7) Your Organisation has Online presence?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Go to question 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8) If No, What are the barriers preventing to have an Online Presence?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9) If Yes, Who is responsible for your online content?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10) What Content Management System do you use?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11) How often do you update the website?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every two weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Artists and Buyers

Suggested additions added by Elinor in red 6th September 2013

ARTISTS

What do we want to find out?

We want to understand how artists interact with site and with online world when it comes to promoting and selling their work, how they build their identity as an artist online and how they interact with buyers/potential buyers.

How can we encourage artists to upload more and better quality content. What are the barriers that prevent them from doing this currently? How do they currently select what information to upload to different platforms (i.e. their own website, a gallery website, twitter, facebook etc) and what to reject?

Artists Background

Who they are and what they do?

1. How old are you?
2. Are you a full time, part time artist or a student?
3. What is your discipline/have you studied?
4. Where do you did you study?
5. When did you/will you graduate from your course?

Artists Technology/Web Usage

How artists interact with the online world in general what do they use, how often do they use them and what for?

1. Which of these do you have, Desktop, Laptop, Android Tablet, iPad, Android Smartphone, Windows Smartphone, iPhone
2. Which of these do you use most to go on-line? - Desktop, Laptop, Android Tablet, iPad, Android Smartphone, Windows Smartphone, iPhone
3. Which Social Media services do you use in relation to your work - Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest, Instagram, Other
4. Do you use any sites to showcase your portfolio? Deviantart, Behance, Flickr, Wix, Personal Website, Other
5. What sites do you use to sell your work? (own website, Saatchi Online, Rise Art, Art Finder, DegreeArt)
6. How would you describe your computer literacy on a scale of 1-5?

Artists Online Aspirations
How do they want to be represented on the internet within a community of artists.

How important is it…. (scale 1-5: 1 being not at all important and 5 being very important)
1. to be able to express your individuality when showing your profile and art works/portfolio?
2. for you and you work to be found by those who are interested?
3. to regularly keep buyers and those interested in you and your work updated with new work and what you are working on?
4. to have access to some background about the buyers purchasing your work, where your work is going and keep some kind of contact?
5. for buyers to know about your background, you’re art/design techniques and philosophy?
6. to be able to discuss issues and get advice from other artists and feel part of a community?
7. for images of your artwork to be displayed clearly and in a large format?
8. is the text description for a piece of your art in selling your work?
9. is the title of a piece?
10. for buyers to see process work such as sketches and first drafts so that they can follow your progress?
11. to gain feedback from buyers or those interested in their work such as comments or ‘likes’?
12. archiving your practice

BUYERS

What do we want to find out?

I was thinking (from a sales perspective) we should add an optional box to receive a curated page of artwork if they want at the end of the questionnaire...
We want to know how buyers instinctively look for art work, whether they prefer to browse through a large collection of images, search for specific terms or a mixture of the two. We want to know how much they like to know about an artist's background, their previous work, how often buyers look and purchase new art work and how much interaction they want with in the art world.

Buyer’s Background

1. How old are you?
2. What is your profession/studying?
3. How would you describe your computer literacy on a scale of 1-5?

Buying Habits

1. How often do you look for new art to buy?
2. What do you predominantly buy artwork for? Collection, decoration, gift, investment?
3. What is your average spending limit when buying a piece of art? £0-50, £51-100, £101-£200, £201-£500, £500-£1000, £1000+
4. Have you bought art online before?
5. Where have you bought art online from before?
6. Do you prefer to buy art online or in person?
7. Are you more interested in new artists, established artists or have no preference?
8. When buying art online, do you feel more of an affinity to the gallery or artist or is it equally balanced?
9. What has prevented you from buying art or more art in the past? What barriers do you perceive existing?

Search Habits

1. Do you enjoy looking through images of art or do you prefer a more specific/refined/curated/personalised approach?
2. When you want to buy a piece of art how clearly do you know what you are looking for?
3. Which of these categories would you use to help refine a search for art? Colour, size, price, room location (within your house) subject matter, style/genre of art,
4. How important is it for you to see as realistic and clear an image of the art you are buying before purchase?
5. Would you rather search for art with large images and details shown once selected or smaller images but with details of price, artist, title and size shown at the same time? Should we include a very basic iframe for this? I think that is a good idea, I will ask Raida to see if she agrees.
6. How important is the description about a piece of art before deciding to buy?

Interaction With Degree Art

1. How important is it for the site to remember art you have recently viewed/show interest in?
2. How much of an artist’s background/personality do you like to know before buying a piece of their work?
3. How important is it for you to see a portfolio of an artists previous and current work?
4. How important is having a loyalty scheme when buying art e.g. spending a certain amount gives you a discount on a future purchase.
5. How important is it for you to be able to follow an artist and be updated on new work and what they are doing?
6. How important is it for you to have contact with an artist?
7. How interested are you in features that updates you on latest activity/news with in the Degree Art community such as like a newsletter/blog/videos about artists and Degree Art
8. How likely are you to make a repeat purchase from an artist you have previously bought from or are you more often looking for new artists?
C. Galleries and Others

For the Artist:

Background

1) How old are you?
   a) 18-25
   b) 26-31
   c) 31-42
   d) 33-older

2) Are you full time, part time art or a student?
   a) Full-time art
   b) Part-time art
   c) Student

3) What is your discipline/have you studied?
   ________________________________

4) What types of art do you produce?
   a) Painting
   b) Drawing
   c) Sculpture
   d) Photography
   e) Print
   f) Installation
   g) Film
   h) Other

Online Behaviour and Internet Presence

5) How competent would you say you are using computers?
   a) Very Good
   b) Good
   c) Average
   d) Poor
   e) Very Poor

6) Which of these do you use to go on-line most?
   a) Desktop
   b) Laptop
   c) Tablet
   d) Smartphone

7) Do you use social media in relation to your art?
   a) Yes
b) No

7a) Which social media services do you use in relation to your art?
   a) Facebook
   b) Twitter
   c) Pinterest
   d) Instagram
   e) Tumblr
   f) Other:

8) Do you use any site to showcase your portfolio/artwork?
   a) Deviantart
   b) Behance
   c) Flickr
   d) Wix
   e) Personal Website
   f) Other:

Business

9) Have you sold art on-line?
   a) Yes
   b) No

9 a) If so, where do you sell your work?
   a) Degree Art
   b) Art Finder
   c) Saatchi Online
   d) Rise Art
   e) Personal Website
   f) Other:

10) Would you like to have request from the public to create a piece?
    a) Yes
    b) No

11) How important is it to be able to express your individuality when showing your artwork and creating a profile for potential buyers?
    a) Very Important
    b) Important
    c) Neither important nor unimportant
    d) Of little importance
    e) Unimportant
12) How important is it to have access to some background information about the buyers purchasing your work, where your work is going and keep some kind of contact?
   a) Very Important
   b) Important
   c) Neither important nor unimportant
   d) Of little importance
   e) Unimportant

For the BUYERS:
<For this user I suggest to collect as more information as we can>

Buyer’s Background
1) How old are you?
   a) 18-25
   b) 26-31
   c) 31-42
   d) 33-older

2) What is your profession?
   _______________________

3) How long have you been purchasing/collecting art?
   a) I am yet to start collecting
   b) In the last few months
   c) In the last year
       d) For 2-4 years
       e) 5 years or more

Online Behaviour

4) How competent would you say you are using computers?
   a) Very Good
   b) Good
       c) Average
   d) Poor
       e) Very Poor

5) Which of these do you use to go on-line most?
   a) Desktop
   b) Laptop
   c) Tablet
   d) Smartphone

6) Do you use social media to look for art or new artists?
   a) Yes
   b) No
6a) Which social media services do you use in relation to your art?
   a) Facebook
   b) Twitter
   c) Pinterest
   d) Instagram
   e) Tumblr
   f) Other:

Buying Habits

7) How often do you look for new art to buy?
   a) Daily
   b) Weekly
   c) Every two weeks
   d) Monthly
   e) Other

8) What do you predominantly buy artwork for?
   a) Collection
   b) Decoration
   c) Gift
   d) Investment

9) What is your average spending limit when buying a piece of art?
   a) £0-50
   b) £51-100
   c) £101-£200
   d) £201-£500
   e) £500-£1000
   f) £1000+

10) Have you bought art online before?
    a) Yes
    b) No

11) Where have you bought art online from before?
    a) I have never bought art online
    b) Degree Art
    c) Saatchi Online
    d) Art Finder
    e) Rise Art
    f) From an artist's website
    g) Other:

12) Do you prefer to buy art online or in person?
    a) In person
13) When buying art online, do you feel more of an affinity to the gallery or artist or is it equally balanced?
   a) Artists
   b) The Gallery
   c) Both Equally

What has prevented you from buying art or more art in the past? What barriers do you perceive existing?
_______________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________

Search Habits

14) Do you enjoy looking through images of art or do you prefer a more specific/refined/curated/personalised approach?
   a) Prefer to browse
   b) Prefer to look at specific topics/areas/personalized
   c) A balance of both

15) When you want to buy a piece of art how clearly do you know what you are looking for?
   a) Yes I have a clear idea
   b) I have a vague idea
   c) I look for whatever catches my eye

16) Which of these categories would you use to help refine a search for art?
   a) Colour
   b) Size
   c) Price,
   d) Room location (within your house)
   e) Subject matter,
   f) Style/genre of art,

17) How important is the description about a piece of art before deciding to buy?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
   c) Neither important nor unimportant
   d) Of little importance
   e) Unimportant

Interaction With Artist
18) How important is it for the site to remember art you have recently viewed/show interest in?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
   c) Neither important nor unimportant
   d) Of little importance
   f) Unimportant

19) How much of an artist’s background/personality do you like to know before buying a piece of their work?
   a) Very detailed background information
   b) Detailed background information
   c) Basic background information
   d) Minimal background information
   e) No background information

20) How important is it for you to see a portfolio of an artist’s previous and current work?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
   c) Neither important nor unimportant
   d) Of little importance
   e) Unimportant

21) How important is it for you to be able to follow an artist and be updated on new work and what they are doing?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
   c) Neither important nor unimportant
   d) Of little importance
   e) Unimportant

22) How important is it for you to have contact with an artist?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
   d) Neither important nor unimportant
   e) Of little importance
   f) Unimportant

23) How likely are you to make a repeat purchase from an artist you have previously bought from or are you more often looking for new artists?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
   c) Neither important nor unimportant
   d) Of little importance
   e) Unimportant
Galleries’ Background

1) How many years of experience your Gallery has?
   a) Less than a year
      b) For 2-4 years
      c) 5 years or more

2) How many artists do you represent?
   a) 1-4
   b) 5-10
   c) 10-20
   d) 20-50
   e) more than 50

Online Presence

3) Who is responsible of your online content?
   __________________________

4) How often do you update your website?
   a) Daily
   b) Weekly
   c) Every two weeks
   d) Monthly
   e) Other

5) Do your gallery use social media?
   a) Yes
   b) No

5a) Which social media services do you use in relation to your art? *
   a) Facebook
   b) Twitter
   c) Pinterest
   d) Instagram
   e) Tumblr
   f) Other:

Interaction (Galleries and Artist)

6) How important is it for a site to remember artist you have recently viewed/show interest in?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
   c) Neither important nor unimportant
   d) Of little importance
e) Unimportant

7) How much of an artist's background/personality do you like to know?
   a) Very detailed background information
      b) Detailed background information
      c) Basic background information
      d) Minimal background information
      e) No background information

8) How important is it for you to see a portfolio of an artist’s previous and current work?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
      c) Neither important nor unimportant
      d) Of little importance
      e) Unimportant

9) How important is it for you to be able to follow an artist and be updated on new work and what they are doing?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
      c) Neither important nor unimportant
      d) Of little importance
      e) Unimportant

10) How important is it for you to have contact with an artist?
    a) Very important
    b) Important
       c) Neither important nor unimportant
       d) Of little importance
       e) Unimportant

Art Organisations Background

1) How many years of experience your Organisation has?
   a) Less than a year
      b) For 2-4 years
      c) 5 years or more

2) How many Galleries do you represent?
   a) 1-9
   b) 10-49
   c) 50-100
   d) more than 200
Online Presence

4) Who is responsible of your online content?
___________________________

5) How often do you update your website?
   a) Daily
   b) Weekly
   c) Every two weeks
   d) Monthly
   e) Other

6) Your organisation social network?
   a) Yes
   b) No

6a) Which social media services do you use in relation to your art? *
   a) Facebook
   b) Twitter
   c) Pinterest
   d) Instagram
   e) Tumblr
   f) Other:

Interaction (Galleries and Organisations)

7) How much of a galleries’ background/personality do you like to know before working with them?
   a) Very detailed background information
   b) Detailed background information
   c) Basic background information
      d) Minimal background information
      e) No background information

8) How important is it for you to see a portfolio of a galleries previous and current work?
   a) Very important
   b) Important
      c) Neither important nor unimportant
      d) Of little importance
      e) Unimportant

9) How important is it for you to be able to follow an artist and be updated on new work and what they are doing?
   a) Very important
      b) Important
c) Neither important nor unimportant
d) Of little importance
e) Unimportant

10) How important is it for you to be able to follow a gallery and be updated on new work and what they are doing?
a) Very important
b) Important
c) Neither important nor unimportant
d) Of little importance
e) Unimportant

11) How important is it for you to have contact with an artist?
a) Very important
b) Important
c) Neither important nor unimportant
d) Of little importance
e) Unimportant

12) How important is it for you to have contact with the gallery?
a) Very important
b) Important
c) Neither important nor unimportant
d) Of little importance
e) Unimportant
## Project Plan

### Artellite project plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Finish date</th>
<th>No. of days</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning &amp; Scoping - Sprint 0</td>
<td>Interpreting the brief and identifying the purpose of this project</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project team meeting</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>28/11/2013</td>
<td>28/11/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nesta Milestone requirements</td>
<td>Initial Research into Artists Usability</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commence artist engagement</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit 4 artists to trial services</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Media Engagement Research Commences</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artist Research Groups x 2 – research report based on 2 groups</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Release Press Release on Project following guidelines</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement of data strategy with Nesta</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with grant conditions, in particular Clause 3.2</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in learning and evaluation activities to reflect on success, impact and learning from the project over the course of the Grant Period.</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation with the Programme Learning Partner and sufficient progress with the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Outline</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>09/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Competitor analysis (Aloke’s doc)</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>13/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritise current site content matrix (using Aloke’s doc)</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>13/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research - identify what users need</td>
<td>Write up 4 questionnaires (Artists, Buyers, Galleries and Art Organisations)</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>12/12/2013</td>
<td>16/12/2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Elinor, Karen, James and</td>
<td>17/12/2013</td>
<td>17/12/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires final amends</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>18/12/2013</td>
<td>19/12/2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires to participants</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>20/12/2013</td>
<td>20/12/2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants to complete questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>20/12/2013</td>
<td>24/12/2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research analysis</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>27/12/2013</td>
<td>30/12/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research report &amp; recommendations</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>02/01/2014</td>
<td>03/01/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of work (SOW)</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>06/01/2014</td>
<td>13/01/2014</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background, proposition and Aim/objectives</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target market</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of requirements (including requirements from research findings)</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>06/01/2013</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information architecture &amp; structure</td>
<td>Raida, James, Andrea</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content strategy</td>
<td>Elinor and James</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative brief development</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical audit and scope</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>08/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce draft SOW document</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>09/01/2014</td>
<td>09/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback and amends on SOW document</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver final Scope of work and timing plan</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>13/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nesta Milestone requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research into front end, search and social Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End and Back End Designs created</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Lead Image Retrieval Research completed?</td>
<td>Elinor, Karen and James</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued artist engagement</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEO Research/ Recommendations to be undertaken and completed</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media Engagement Research Completes</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End User Research Group x 1 – report based on the findings of the user group of potential customers</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory progress with data strategy</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation with the Programme Learning Partner and sufficient progress with the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Outline</strong></td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance with grant conditions, in particular Clause 3.2</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completion of quarterly progress review with Nesta and/ or the Learning Partner</strong></td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development - Sprint 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sprint meeting</strong></th>
<th><strong>Project team</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creative concept development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brainstorm</strong></td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td>14/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concept work up</strong></td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>15/01/2014</td>
<td>17/01/2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation of concepts</strong></td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>20/01/2014</td>
<td>20/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>21/01/2014</td>
<td>21/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revisions</strong></td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>22/01/2014</td>
<td>22/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign-off</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>23/01/2014</td>
<td>23/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Produce final design spec &amp; style guide</strong></td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Architecture &amp; structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create a sitemap</strong></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>15/01/2014</td>
<td>17/01/2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Karen, James and Raida</td>
<td>20/01/2014</td>
<td>20/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision</strong></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>21/01/2014</td>
<td>21/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>22/01/2014</td>
<td>22/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision</strong></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>23/01/2014</td>
<td>23/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign-off</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>24/01/2014</td>
<td>24/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use cases and scenarios</strong></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>15/01/2014</td>
<td>17/01/2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Karen &amp; Elinor</td>
<td>20/01/2014</td>
<td>20/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision</strong></td>
<td>James</td>
<td>21/01/2014</td>
<td>21/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign-off</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>22/01/2014</td>
<td>22/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing Personas &amp; user journeys</strong></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>24/01/2014</td>
<td>28/01/2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Karen &amp; Raida</td>
<td>29/01/2014</td>
<td>29/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision</strong></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>30/01/2014</td>
<td>30/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>31/01/2014</td>
<td>31/01/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision</strong></td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>03/02/2014</td>
<td>03/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sign-off</strong></td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>04/02/2014</td>
<td>04/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop wireframes / sketches for prototype</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create wireframes</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>04/02/2014</td>
<td>07/02/2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Karen and Raida</td>
<td>10/02/2014</td>
<td>10/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>11/02/2014</td>
<td>12/02/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>13/02/2014</td>
<td>13/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>14/02/2014</td>
<td>14/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>17/02/2014</td>
<td>17/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New site recommended content</td>
<td>Elinor and James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Develop full technical scope**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write up technical architecture spec</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>09/01/2014</td>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programming Build - for prototype**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write up technical architecture spec</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>09/01/2014</td>
<td>10/01/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Karen, James and Raida</td>
<td>10/02/2014</td>
<td>10/02/2014</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>12/02/2014</td>
<td>14/02/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>17/02/2014</td>
<td>17/02/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concept evaluation (what users want)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research guide</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>17/02/2014</td>
<td>18/02/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Karen, James and Raida</td>
<td>19/02/2014</td>
<td>19/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amends</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>20/02/2014</td>
<td>20/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>21/02/2014</td>
<td>21/02/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting user research using prototype</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>24/02/2014</td>
<td>25/02/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research analysis</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>26/02/2014</td>
<td>27/02/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research report &amp; recommendations</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>28/02/2014</td>
<td>03/03/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Production - Sprint 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop wireframes</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>04/03/2014</td>
<td>10/03/2014</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Karen, James and Raida</td>
<td>11/03/2014</td>
<td>11/03/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>12/03/2014</td>
<td>13/03/2014</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>14/03/2014</td>
<td>14/03/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>17/03/2014</td>
<td>17/03/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>18/03/2014</td>
<td>18/03/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design templates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>create design templates</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>12/03/2014</td>
<td>18/03/2014</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>19/03/2014</td>
<td>19/03/2014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/03/2014</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Create assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Write up a copy deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Images / videos (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/03/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/03/2014</td>
<td>Karen, James</td>
<td>Preferences research - evaluating designs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/03/2014</td>
<td>and Raida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Contact target participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/03/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Amends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Conducting user research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Research analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Research report &amp; recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Next design iteration - Research findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Wireframes amends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2014</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Programming /Build - for Beta release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2014</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2014</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2014</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2014</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>Revison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/04/2014</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Other Nesta milestone requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Product to be launched and tested (post launch?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Final period of research and initial draft report to be completed and shared with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Nesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Front End and Back End Development to be completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Designs to be completed based on product testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>Continued artist engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Elinor and</td>
<td>SEO Research/ Recommendations to be integrated into designs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Social Media Research &amp; Marketing Recommendations to be delivered and integrated</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with the Programme Learning Partner and sufficient progress with the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Outline</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in learning and evaluation activities to reflect on success, impact and learning from the project over the course of the Grant Period.</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of quarterly progress review with Nesta and/or the Learning Partner</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with grant conditions, in particular Clause 3.2</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>23/04/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Production - Sprint 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sprint meeting (update list of requirements based on research findings)</td>
<td>Project team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming / build - for launch</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>28/04/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Karen, James and Elinor</td>
<td>30/06/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>01/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>03/07/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Usability evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact target participants</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research guide</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>27/06/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Karen, James &amp; Raida</td>
<td>01/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>02/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>03/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>04/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign-off</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>07/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting user research</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>08/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research analysis</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>10/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research report &amp; recommendations</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>14/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA testing</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>04/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final amends</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>16/07/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivery / Project completion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final files delivered</td>
<td>Marcelo</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Nesta Milestone requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform to be officially launched to</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research to be published and shared with the wider arts community</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion and dissemination of the Project’s final research report prepared by the Recipient’s research partner including data outputs agreed in the data strategy</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation with the Programme Learning Partner and sufficient progress with the Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Outline</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in learning and evaluation activities to reflect on success, impact and learning from the project over the course of the Grant Period.</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of quarterly progress review with Nesta and/or the Learning Partner</td>
<td>Elinor and Karen</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with grant conditions, in particular Clause 3.2</td>
<td>Elinor</td>
<td>21/07/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>