

EU COMMUNITY

ICT-2013.5.4 ICT for Governance and Policy Modelling



*EU COMMUNITY MERGES ICT AND SOCIAL MEDIA NETWORKING WITH
ESTABLISHED ONLINE MEDIA AND STAKEHOLDER GROUPS TO CULTIVATE
TRANSPARENCY, ENHANCE EFFICIENCY AND STIMULATE FRESH IDEAS FOR EU
POLICY-MAKING.*

Deliverable D1.2.2

EU Community Experts Committee activity report (second version)

Editor(s):	Babis Ipektsidis, Vivian Kiousi
Responsible Partner:	INTRASOFT International SA
Status-Version:	Final - v1.0
Date:	30.09.2015
EC Distribution:	PU

Project Number:	611964
Project Title:	EU COMMUNITY

Title of Deliverable:	D1.2.2 EU Community Experts Committee activity report (second version)
Date of Delivery to the EC:	30/09/2015

Workpackage responsible for the Deliverable:	WP1 - Project Management
Editor(s):	Babis Ipektsidis, Vivian Kiousi
Contributor(s):	INTRA-BE, INTRA
Reviewer(s):	INTRA-BE, INTRA-LUX, FONDATION, AEGEAN, EURACTIV, ATC, I-EUROPA , FRAUNHOFER IGD, UOC
Approved by:	All Partners

Abstract:	This deliverable describes the methodology for widely disseminating and proactively engaging the paid external experts in sharing their expertise and discussing on the 'EU Community' concept and their involvement in the work of the project
Keyword List:	Experts

Document Description

Document Revision History

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Modifications Introduced</i>	
		<i>Modification Reason</i>	<i>Modified by</i>
V0.10	26/08/2015	ToC	INTRA-BE
V0.20	18/09/2015	Contributions	INTRA-BE, INTRA
V0.30	25/09/2015	Version to be reviewed	INTRA-BE
V0.40	29/09/2015	Reviewers comments included	INTRA-BE
V1.0	30/09/2015	Final Version	INTRA-BE

Contents

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
2	INTRODUCTION	9
2.1	PURPOSE AND SCOPE.....	9
2.2	APPROACH FOR WORK PACKAGE 1 AND RELATION TO OTHER WORK PACKAGES AND DELIVERABLES	10
2.3	STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT.....	10
3	THE EU COMMUNITY' EXPERTS COMMITTEE AND INVOLVEMENT IN THE DIFFERENT WP'S	11
3.1	EU COMMUNITY EXPERTS COMMITTEE ROLE.....	11
3.2	ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY EXPERTS IN YEAR 2.....	12
3.2.1	WP3 "Opinion Mining & Reputation Management Component"	12
3.2.2	WP4 "Policy Modelling and Impact Assessment Component"	13
3.2.3	WP5 "Visualisation Component"	13
3.2.4	WP6 "Platform Development"	14
3.2.5	WP7 "Pilots Operation"	15
3.2.6	WP8 "Evaluation".....	15
3.2.7	WP9 "Dissemination & Exploitation"	16
4	CONCLUSIONS.....	17
I.	APPENDIX A: EU COMMUNITY EXPERTS QUESTIONNAIRE - OPINION MINING / SENTIMENT ANALYSIS.....	18
II.	APPENDIX B: EU COMMUNITY EXPERTS QUESTIONNAIRE - REPUTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	21
III.	APPENDIX C: EU COMMUNITY EXPERTS QUESTIONNAIRE - POLICY COMPONENT	25
IV.	APPENDIX D: HARDCOPY USABILITY TEST.....	29

List of Figures

FIGURE 1: CREATE A POLICY PROCESS	30
FIGURE 2: ADD DOCUMENTS TO THE PROCESS	31
FIGURE 3: TIMELINE: SEE THE CREATED PROCESS IN THE TIMELINE VIEW	33

List of Tables

TABLE 1: DEFINITIONS, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS..... 7

Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations

Table 1: Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym	Title
DL	Deliverable Leader
DoW	Description of Work
Dx	Deliverable (<i>where x defines the deliverable identification number e.g. D1.1.1</i>)
EU	European Union
WP	Workpackage

1 Executive Summary

This deliverable provides an overview of the activities undertaken by the engaged relevant stakeholders in sharing their expertise and discussing on the EU Community concept.

The EU Community project has from its beginning undertaken, the necessary steps to engage groups of stakeholders related to EU Community, including high-calibre experts in the domain, policy makers and industry. In this respect and in order to facilitate the objectives set the project has defined the role of an 'EU Community' Expert. These experts come from a multidisciplinary academic education and diverse professional background representing Policy Analysts/Policy Making experts, Application Coordinators and Social Media & Complex Systems Mentors etc. They participate and contribute, to meetings with the EU Community consortium to brainstorm on how to improve knowledge on the present status and needs for effective policy making, on the extraction of requirements, scenarios and on the definition of procedures and the evaluation of existing systems. Furthermore, they provide responses/input to inquiries on specific questions relevant to their expertise.

This deliverable aims to provide an overview of the function the experts have in the project, to describe the experts' involvement per workpackage and clarify the tasks where their expertise was used.

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose and Scope

The aim of the Deliverable 1.2.2 is to describe the activities undertaken by the EU Community Experts Committee in the process of sharing their expertise and discussing on the 'EU Community' concept.

The 'EU Community' project has from its beginning undertaken, the necessary steps to engage a group of stakeholders related to 'EU Community', including high-calibre experts in the domain, policy makers and industry representatives.

In order to facilitate the objectives set and in the same time reinforce its outcomes and impacts, the project has defined the role of an 'EU Community' Expert via an internal brainstorming session. The identified experts represent different professional fields such as Policy Analysts/Policy Making experts, Application Coordinators and Social Media & Complex Systems Mentors.

The Experts are called to participate in dedicated project meetings after receiving a formal invitation by the consortium members. Some of the experts participated in the creative workshops and their involvement is also foreseen in further EU Community dedicated events, as well as other project activities, a list of which is presented below. The EU Community experts are expected to:

- Participate and contribute, to meetings with the EU Community consortium to improve knowledge on present status and needs elicitation for effective policy making, extraction of requirements, scenarios building and definition of procedures and evaluation of existing systems
- Provide responses to inquiries on specific questions relevant to their expertise
- Participate in the evaluation of specific project components
- Attend and actively participate in 'EU Community' workshops and in the final evaluation and dissemination event
- Contribute to European norms and Standards in terms of organisation and procedures

The vision is that only with the actual engagement of multiple stakeholders with a diverse background the project can reach a clear understanding of their expectations and develop a community-driven policy modelling framework and platform addressing their actual needs.

Through the process already described in detail in the first version of the EU Community Experts Committee activity report 25 experts had been selected to share their expertise. Three of them help the project to build pilot communities whereas another twenty-two experts assist the consortium with matters related to research and innovation in the field of policy making.

2.2 Approach for Work Package 1 and Relation to other Work Packages and Deliverables

The EU Community' Experts Committee Activities refers to Task 1.2 EU Community' Experts Committee Activities, and is part of Work Package 1 Project Management. The aim of WP1 is to perform the overall project government activities in order to ensure the smooth evolution of the project, the harmonized collaboration among the engaged members (partners, stakeholders, community members, etc.) as well as the most appropriate distribution of resources using specific mechanisms for identifying and resolving problems and risks.

2.3 Structure of the Document

This deliverable is structured as follows: Section 3 discusses the activities undertaken by the EU Community' Experts Committee, while Section 4 wraps up the contents of the document.

3 The EU Community' Experts Committee and involvement in the different WP's

This chapter begins with the illustration of the importance of the experts Committee to the project and the added value these experts bring to the project.

3.1 EU Community Experts Committee Role

The EU Community project aims to put users in the driving seat. In order to facilitate this process, the project has decided to utilise the know-how of experts. These experts will provide regular and meaningful input and will ensure that the project objectives are broadly understood and the project activities and outcomes are communicated to policy sector stakeholders and decision makers.

The experts that comprise the EU Community's Expert Committee are considered as a sample group of the future users of the EU Community Platform and act as a pilot panel. They also act as internal evaluators and scientific advisors to the project, according to their individual expertise. They do not only provide guidance and answer specific questions but also provide material contribution in the form of data gathering, analysis on sensitive topics and benchmarking with other studies.

More specifically the role of the experts is divided in two main pillars, the theoretical and the practical one. The "theoretical" pillar, concerns input and advice, regarding scientific and technical EU Community objectives and outcomes, and is supported mainly by policy analysts and policy making experts, application coordinators and finally social media & complex systems mentors. The experts interested to become part of this Committee have indicated their high level expertise in one or more of the fields listed below.

- Data mining
- Semantic web
- Sentiment analysis
- Open data
- Serious gaming
- Reputation management
- Visualisation
- Policy modelling
- Community building

In addition to the theoretical pillar described above, there is also the "practical" pillar, which concerns contribution into the planning and participation in the planned Pilot Cases, which are

- Renewable Energy
- Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- Future of EU

The three pilot cases are all hot topics for the 2014-2019 mandates and deep enough to engage specific stakeholders, NGOs and private players. Two topics are more economy and value-driven – Renewable Energy and Innovation & Entrepreneurship, while the third is political: Future of EU.

3.2 Activities undertaken by experts in Year 2

The experts collaborate closely with the project consortium and take part in consultations in order to contribute, comment and validate the projects achievements. This involvement has been already initiated from the conceptualisation and the requirements analysis workshops and is continued throughout the design phase and also during the demonstration and evaluation phases.

Thus, the selected experts have already participated in Year 1 in a series of stakeholder workshops where their opinion was consulted on the EU Community aspects. The vision driving the expert involvement from the very beginning is that, only with the actual engagement of multiple different stakeholders with a different background, the project can reach a clear understanding of their expectations and develop a community-driven policy modelling framework and platform addressing their actual needs. The following subsections will report on the involvement of experts in the specific Workpackages.

3.2.1 WP3 “Opinion Mining & Reputation Management Component”

Regarding WP3 the involvement of experts was envisaged in the topic modelling, opinion mining and text mining tasks. In the Reputation Management section of WP3 the experts’ involvement was foreseen in order to examine, test and express their opinion. The outcome of this brainstorming was to result with an efficient algorithm for computing one person’s online reputation.

In detail the tasks that required the experts’ involvement for the second year of the project were:

- Providing Feedback to the second version of Opinion mining and Sentiment analysis module.
- Providing Feedback to the second version of the Reputation Management module.
- Expanding the ranking methodology used

In order to be able to collect feedback in a structured manner selected experts were provided with two questionnaires the first one addressing the Critical Factors for Opinion Mining / Sentiment Analysis and a second one addressing the Critical

Factors for Reputation Management. In total 7 experts have replied to these questionnaires, which can be found at the appendixes.

In the process of incorporating experts' feedback into the developed modules, the third version of these modules will be mainly based on the EU Community experts' feedback collected through these activities as also during the Initial system integration and the First Integrated Prototype and the Creation of the sub-communities and Detailed pilot scenarios.

3.2.2 WP4 "Policy Modelling and Impact Assessment Component"

WP4 focuses on the policy models and impact assessment components. In this Workpackage the experts' involvement is foreseen in the activities of Policy Modelling & Policy Formation Process Modelling and Determination.

Specifically, one of the important goals of the project is to inform users of emerging policy formation processes. In these respective experts will be consulted regarding the approach and tools they use for the identification and the follow up of new policy proposals. Additionally, an important element to be asked is how information is shared with the public during the creation of policy proposals. Moreover, the experts will be consulted on the key stages in the creation and subsequent lifecycle of a new policy.

Finally, in relation to the impact assessment task, one of the project activities is the creation of a predictive model. This predictive model will use the collected data about the number of relevant documents per topic per day per category of author (Policy Maker, Influencer, Media Analyst) and using a mathematical model will produce predictions regarding the same kind of data for the following days. The experts will be involved to brainstorm on the potential mathematical models that will be used and on how these models should be processed (in order to take into account also unexpected events that may influence these results).

In this respect selected experts have been identified in the process of designing the system. These experts are currently invited in dedicated calls in order that the WP leader

- presents to the experts the latest updates of the project
- demonstrates the currently available tools and the EU Community platform
- presents the Policy Component
- discuss with the experts about the functionalities of the Policy Component (Simulation & Hybrid Predictions Subsystems)
- describes the questionnaire that the experts will be requested to answer

3.2.3 WP5 "Visualisation Component"

Moving on to WP5 Visualisation Components there have been mainly two tasks where experts have been involved in, in the second year of the project. These include:

- Providing feedback to visual design mock-ups. Visualisation experts were presented with the first version of the visualization mock ups in order to receive the necessary user input. In fact the visualisation expert Mr David Price participated in a 2 day project meeting that took place in Darmstadt and where the main focus was on presenting mock-ups and exchanging ideas about the PolicyLine visualisation. In addition Ms Laetitia Veriter (Expert for the Pilot: Future of EU) and Mr Tony Venables (Expert for Community building, transparency and governance) participated via electronic means in a dedicated call in respect to Policyline.
- Providing feedback on the first version of the visualization prototypes. Experts were presented with the first version of the visualization prototype in order to provide the necessary user input and rate the usability for the end-user. In this frame the experts were invited to fulfil specific tasks and answer questions in respect to the evaluation of PolicyLine. This exercise was completed by 11 experts.

Feedback to the second version of the visualization prototype is an activity that will take place in the third year of the project. This second evaluation will prove the prototypes' functionalities and induce last fine-tuning steps and final design decisions.

3.2.4 WP6 "Platform Development"

In regards to WP6, the expert involvement was in relation to the reviewing and testing of EurActory and privacy related issues of the data where EurActory deals. The selected experts were invited to use EurActory both as a registered users/expert as also as public users (anonymous user). The experts also commented on the profile pages and made suggestions on how to enhance the tool, and also deal with privacy related issues. In total 5 Experts have provided their comments so far.

During the development period of October/November 2014 for EurActory and June/July 2015 for the Platform Prototype, continuous tests took place providing to the integrated prototype all the needed enhancements. The platform now includes the integration of content and modules from the other technical work packages, as well as the APIs to enable the smooth interaction of the 'EU Community' individual modules, in order to perform the foreseen functionalities. The initial version of the integrated 'EU Community' platform offers the capability to the Consortium partners to evaluate the functionalities provided in real life use cases, receive timely feedback from potential stakeholders of the platform and work with the appropriate modifications towards delivering the final prototype.

The tasks where experts will increasingly contribute from now on concerns the usability Evaluation of the Integrated Platform Prototype that includes EurActory, PolicyLine as also the different modules that have been developed in the frame of the other technical workpackages. Feedback to the final version of the Integrated Prototype is an activity that will take place in the third year of the project.

3.2.5 WP7 “Pilots Operation”

WP7 concerns the Pilot operations and thus represents the practical pillar of the project, which concerns contribution into the planning and participation in the planned Pilot Cases, which are

- Energy Union (previous Renewable Energy)
- Innovation and Entrepreneurship
- Future of EU

For the pilot activities three of the experts, each one in his field of specialisation, provide their expertise and input in the pilots. In the pilot Energy Union the selected expert is Mr. Jason Anderson who has been the Head of European Climate Change and Energy Policy at the WWF European Policy Office. Since Mr. Anderson has recently moved out of Europe, he will be replaced. For the pilot Innovation and entrepreneurship the expert is Mr. Kumardev Chatterjee an entrepreneurial innovation leader, experienced ICT industry professional and a recognised European Commission appointed Expert. He is currently the Founder and President of the independent, non-profit, European Young Innovators Forum (EYIF www.eyif.eu) and has been awarded in June 2014 as an Innovation Luminary - Young Innovation Champion by the European Commission and Intel. Finally, for the pilot Future of EU, the expert is Ms. Laetitia Veriter who is project and communications officer in the European Movement International (EMI) one of the largest pan and pro-European civil society organisations with currently more than 70 Member Organisations, bringing together representatives from European associations, political parties, enterprises and trade unions.

The pilot cases presented below are all hot topics for the 2014-2019 mandates and deep enough to engage specific stakeholders, NGOs and private players. The two pilots, Renewable Energy and Innovation & Entrepreneurship, are economy and value-driven, whereas the third pilot the Future of EU is more political.

The experts have been invited to update also the policyline with concrete ongoing policy process. These processes include official documents from the European Commission as well as published articles on the topics.

Some of these tasks have already started in the second Year of the project and will continue to the third Year. Especially the selection, mapping and engagement of stakeholders and moderators will be a continuous activity during both periods.

3.2.6 WP8 “Evaluation”

Moving on to WP8 entitled “Evaluation”, the experts will:

- provide feedback on the evaluation metrics that will be used by the project to rate the results elicited
- take part in the evaluation exercise
- provide comments on the feedback reports with the interim results of the evaluation

3.2.7 WP9 “Dissemination & Exploitation”

The activities of this workpackage aim to appropriately setup and coordinate the project communication and dissemination of results. Some of the most important tasks include ensuring that the solution looks attractive to target groups and mainly EU Policy Stakeholders and to end the project with a commercially viable solution and business plan.

In this workpackage the experts contributed in the second year on the exploitation and enriching of the business plan that the project developed. Additionally the experts help us in community building and engagement of the users in pilots as also on the preparation of community engagement tools.

4 Conclusions

This Deliverable presented the involvement of the most relevant stakeholders in sharing their expertise and discussing on the EU Community concept.

The process of engaging high-calibre experts, including policy makers, policy influencers, policy analysts and industry has started from the very start of the project. In order to facilitate the objectives set and in the same time reinforce its outcomes and impacts, the project has defined the role of an 'EU Community' Expert. These experts participate to dedicated project meetings and are involved in the work of the project in order to improve knowledge on the present status and on the needs for effective policymaking.

The vision of the project is that only with the actual engagement of multiple different stakeholders with a different background the project can reach a clear understanding of their expectations and develop a community-driven policy modelling framework and platform addressing their actual needs. During the second year experts were asked to provide their input on topics that are crucial for the development and the usability of the tools.

During the third year of the project, the involvement of experts will be continuous and more focussed on the further development of pilots. Experts will be contacted in a group specific level in order to discuss the next steps of their involvement and in order to reinforce the collaboration and the community building. Tasks that will be undertaken by experts in the third year include the further provision of feedback for the various modules and prototypes developed in the various workpackages. Furthermore, regarding the pilots the experts will select, map and engage stakeholders/moderators and users. In relation to the evaluation metrics, experts will provide their feedback and comments on the four feedback reports. Finally, the experts will exploit and enrich the final version of the business plan.

I. APPENDIX A: EU Community Experts Questionnaire - Opinion Mining / Sentiment Analysis

Critical Factors for Opinion Mining / Sentiment Analysis

To what extent do you consider the following factors critical within analysing policy related Web 2.0 content? *

	Very uncritical	Uncritical	Neutral	Critical	Very critical
Access and be able to process different types of sources (Facebook, Twitter, blogs, media sites, web pages etc.)	<input type="radio"/>				
Process short posts	<input type="radio"/>				
Process blog posts and news articles	<input type="radio"/>				
Process full documents	<input type="radio"/>				
Process comments in reply to original articles	<input type="radio"/>				
Identify subjective information	<input type="radio"/>				
Extract specific subjective document parts	<input type="radio"/>				
Characterise the polarity of the opinion expressed (positive / negative / neutral)	<input type="radio"/>				
Determine the strength of the opinion (e.g., weak, strong, very strong)	<input type="radio"/>				
Characterise the overall polarity of a document	<input type="radio"/>				
Detect existing or emerging topics	<input type="radio"/>				
Estimate the correlation among different topics	<input type="radio"/>				
Accumulate positive / negative statements on a topic	<input type="radio"/>				
Estimate support or opposition towards a topic	<input type="radio"/>				
Cluster content referring to the same topic	<input type="radio"/>				

	Very uncritical	Uncritical	Neutral	Critical	Very critical
Calculate similarity between documents	<input type="radio"/>				
Use topic modelling to provide more precise results	<input type="radio"/>				
Aggregate the polarity within a collection of content	<input type="radio"/>				
Detect suspicious content and activity (anti-trolling filter)	<input type="radio"/>				
Detect manipulation of people opinion's	<input type="radio"/>				
Identify opinion leaders	<input type="radio"/>				
Find topic-specific interest groups	<input type="radio"/>				
Provide temporal information on the evolution of the polarity of a specific topic	<input type="radio"/>				
Extract arguments	<input type="radio"/>				
Summarise argumentative information	<input type="radio"/>				

To what extent are the following factors critical to the design of the Opinion Mining and Sentiment Analysis module? *

	Very Uncritical	Uncritical	Neutral	Critical	Very Critical
Accuracy	<input type="radio"/>				
Effectiveness	<input type="radio"/>				
Efficiency	<input type="radio"/>				
Scalability	<input type="radio"/>				
Extensibility	<input type="radio"/>				

Do you see any legal issues that should be taken into account in opinion mining processing? *

e.g. user anonymity, data privacy

Which visualisations to convey the opinion mining results would you suggest? *

e.g. term cloud, maps, line charts, scatter charts, networks

Personal Information

Full Name *

What is your gender? *

- Male
 Female

What is your age? *

- 18 - 30
 31 - 40
 41 - 50
 51 - 60
 > 60

What is your nationality? *

Which of the following describes your occupation best? *

- Civil servant / Policy Maker
 Researcher / Student
 Software Developer
 Entrepreneur / Business Analyst
 Journalist
 Domain Expert
 Other:

II. APPENDIX B: EU Community Experts Questionnaire - Reputation Management System

Critical Factors for Reputation Management

To what extent do you consider the following reputation criteria critical to determine the reputation of one person participating in the policy debate?*

	Very Uncritical	Uncritical	Neutral	Critical	Very Critical
Self-evaluation: The ability of users to define the areas of his/her expertise	<input type="radio"/>				
Peer-assessment: The ability of users to endorse each other in different areas of expertise	<input type="radio"/>				
Business Card Reputation: The reputation of one's person job position combining the reputation of the organisation and his/her position in the organisation	<input type="radio"/>				
Document Assessment: The reputation of the documents a person has produced	<input type="radio"/>				
Proximity Trust: The level of connectedness between two persons as determined by social graph distances or organisational charts	<input type="radio"/>				
Network Value: The influence of one's person as the sum of the reputation of his/her network / connections	<input type="radio"/>				
Past Measurements: One's person past reputation	<input type="radio"/>				
Offline Reputation: The reputation of persons with no online presence	<input type="radio"/>				

To what extent do you consider the following factors critical within the calculation of the reputation of one person participating in the policy debate? *

	Very Uncritical	Uncritical	Neutral	Critical	Very Critical
Define reputation on a per topic basis instead of an overall reputation score per user	<input type="radio"/>				
Synthesise independent reputation criteria values on the basis of their weighted average	<input type="radio"/>				
Use social media as reputation data sources (e.g. LinkedIn, Twitter)	<input type="radio"/>				
Combine crawled reputation data with manually provided user's input	<input type="radio"/>				
Documents reputation score are calculated based on their quality, relevance with the policy process position endorsement	<input type="radio"/>				
In document assessment multiple author's reputation is assigned in full to all of them	<input type="radio"/>				
In peer assessment the reputation of the endorser is taken into account	<input type="radio"/>				
Peer-assessment between persons that work together have different weights	<input type="radio"/>				
Customisability: Enable users to customise the reputation calculation	<input type="radio"/>				
Performance: Provide real time reputation scores to users setting new configurations	<input type="radio"/>				
Transparency: Enable users to examine how their reputation was calculated	<input type="radio"/>				

What input will be valuable to calculate the offline reputation of someone? *

Which time frame should be taken into account when calculating one's person past reputation? *

- More than 4 years ago
- 4 years ago
- 1 year ago
- 6 months ago
- 1 month ago
- A weighted average of all the above

Which other reputation management characteristics or functionalities would you suggest? *

Personal Information

Full Name *

What is your gender? *

- Male
- Female

What is your age? *

- 18 - 30
- 31 - 40
- 41 - 50
- 51 - 60
- > 60

What is your nationality? *

Which of the following describes your occupation best? *

- Civil servant / Policy Maker
- Researcher / Student

- Software Developer
- Entrepreneur / Business Analyst
- Journalist
- Domain Expert
- Other:

III. APPENDIX C: EU Community Experts Questionnaire - Policy Component

Critical Factors for the Simulation Subsystem

The Simulation Subsystem utilises System Dynamics modelling to provide predictions of the dynamics of a policy process / deliberation (Will it move in a positive direction? Will interest wane in a few weeks? How much will an event boost awareness?) in the form of time series data.

To what extent do you consider the following metrics critical within the evolvment of the policy debate? *

	Very Uncritical	Uncritical	Neutral	Critical	Very Critical
The number of people aware of the policy process (awareness)	<input type="radio"/>				
The number of people who have contributed in the policy process, e.g. by a document submission (engagement)	<input type="radio"/>				
The total number of documents associated with the policy process (volume)	<input type="radio"/>				
The number of documents associated with the policy process per type of author (Institution / Media / Stakeholders)	<input type="radio"/>				
The number of documents associated with the policy process per sentiment (positive / negative)	<input type="radio"/>				
The homogeneity/polarity between positive and negative documents (controversy)	<input type="radio"/>				
The number of comments submitted to documents associated with the process	<input type="radio"/>				

Which other metrics concerning the policy process would you like to be predicted?

To what extent do you consider the following factors critical to affect the evolution of a policy process?

	Very Uncritical	Uncritical	Neutral	Critical	Very Critical
The publication of institutional documents (e.g. by EU or local governments)	<input type="radio"/>				
The publication of stakeholders' documents (e.g. by civil society organisation)	<input type="radio"/>				
The publication of media articles	<input type="radio"/>				
The comments expressed on Social Media (e.g. tweets)	<input type="radio"/>				
The reproductions of documents, articles or Social Media posts (e.g. retweets)	<input type="radio"/>				
The reputation of persons involved in the policy process	<input type="radio"/>				
The organisation of relevant physical events	<input type="radio"/>				
The existence of an ongoing relevant EU legislative procedure	<input type="radio"/>				

Which other factors do you consider that affect the evolution of a policy process? *

To what extent do you agree with the following? *

	Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
I find the predictions provided by the Simulation Subsystem useful	<input type="radio"/>				
I would use the Simulation Subsystem to experiment with alternative scenarios and get predictions	<input type="radio"/>				
I intend to trust the predictions provided by the Simulation Subsystem	<input type="radio"/>				

Critical Factors for the Hybrid Predictions Subsystem

The Simulation Subsystem utilises Human Expert Opinions and AI to predict when a legislative procedure will end and what the outcome of it will be.

To what extent do you consider that human experts will be better than a Statistical Predictor in making predictions about a legislative procedure?

	Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
On when the legislation procedure will end	<input type="radio"/>				
On what will be the outcome of the legislation procedure	<input type="radio"/>				
On when the legislation procedure will move to the next step	<input type="radio"/>				
On what will be the next step	<input type="radio"/>				

To what extent do you find the following predictions of the Hybrid Predictions Subsystem useful:

	Totally Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally Agree
On when the legislation procedure will end (assuming an accuracy of 90%)	<input type="radio"/>				
On what will be the outcome of the legislation procedure (assuming an accuracy of 55% given a error tolerance level of +/- 3 months)	<input type="radio"/>				
On when the legislation procedure will move to the next step (assuming a reasonable accuracy given a error tolerance level of +/- 2 months)	<input type="radio"/>				
On what will be the next step (assuming a reasonable accuracy)	<input type="radio"/>				

Which other suggestion would you make concerning the predictions on the legislative process?

How would you suggest we incorporate an Impact Assessment element in the policy process? *
(Questionnaires for users, Official Impact Assessment documents, other?)

Personal Information

Full Name *

What is your gender? *

- Male
 Female

What is your age? *

- 18 - 30
 31 - 40
 41 - 50
 51 - 60
 > 60

What is your nationality? *

Which of the following describes your occupation best? *

- Civil servant / Policy Maker
 Researcher / Student
 Software Developer
 Entrepreneur / Business Analyst
 Journalist
 Domain Expert
 Other:

IV. APPENDIX D: Hardcopy Usability Test EU Community – The PolicyLine Component Usability Evaluation

Intro

The EU Community project is a joint research project funded by the European commission with the goal of supporting policy makers in their policy debate. At the following Link (URL: <http://policyline.eucommunity.eu/>) you will find an intermediate version of the PolicyLine prototype. The usability test and the underlying questionnaire will be used to evaluate and improve the current version of the integrated prototype.

Personal Information

Name (optional): _____

Age: _____

Gender: _____

Profile Type: Decision Maker Analyst Influencer

Profession: _____

Area of expertise: _____

Degree of education: _____

After Scenario Usability Test

Please follow the next steps and fill in the empty spaces with the answers or select the rating of your choice for the questions requiring rating.

Firstly, visit the prototype by visiting the following link:

<http://policyline.eucommunity.eu/>

Please log in utilising your system credentials.

Task 1

Please create a new policy process under the topic ***Future of EU!***

After completing the task, please click on "Next".

Task 2

Please add 5 documents to the created policy process.

After completing the task, please click on "Next".

Task 3

Please see the policy process you created in the timeline view.

Does the system correctly represent the information you have entered?

Yes No

Comments if applicable:

That concludes the test, thank you. Feel free to explore the application further, and please answer the following questionnaire. Try to respond to all items. Please send the filled in questionnaire to: tobias.ruppert@igd.fraunhofer.de

Usability Questionnaire 1/6 **Policy Process Creation**

As a first step in the previous task completion test you had to create a new policy process.

Figure 1: Create a policy process

Looking at the interface – How would you judge the intuitiveness of the interface?

How would you judge the organisation and display of information through the interface?

Which information is missing in the interface?

Do you have any suggestions for improving the interface? (enhancements, deletions of redundant items, etc.)

Is there more information about a policy process that you would like to enter in the form?

Is there a field that you are not able to fill in? Why?

Usability Questionnaire 2/6 **Policy Process Creation**

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

The interface successfully allows me to

create a policy process	-2	-1	0	1	2
	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
I intuitively knew how to use the interface	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2
	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
The organisation and display of information through the interface is clear	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2
	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
The interface provides all the information I need.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

Usability Questionnaire 3/6 **Adding documents to the policy process**

After creating a new policy process, you had to add several documents to the process.

Figure 2: Add documents to the process

Looking at the interface – How would you judge the intuitiveness of the interface?

How would you judge the organisation and display of information through the interface?

Which information is missing in the interface?

Do you have any suggestions for improving the interface?
(enhancements, deletions of redundant items, etc.)

Is there more information about a policy process that you would like to enter in the form?

Is there a field that you are not able to fill in? Why?

Usability Questionnaire 4/6

Adding documents to the policy process

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
The interface successfully allows me to add documents to a policy process	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
I intuitively knew how to use the interface	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
The organisation and display of information through the interface is clear	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
The interface provides all the information I need.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

Usability Questionnaire 5/6

Explore the created policy process via the timeline

Finally, after creating the process and adding some documents to it, you were able to explore the process in the timeline view.



Process Details

Here are the detailed informations about the policy process.

Timeline

This is the development of the process over time.



Add a Document

Attach a relevant document to this process.

[Add a document to this process](#)

Figure 3: Timeline: See the created process in the timeline view

Looking at the interface – How would you judge the intuitiveness of the interface?

How would you judge the organisation and display of information through the interface?

Which information is missing in the interface?

Do you have any suggestions for improving the interface? (enhancements, deletions of redundant items, etc.)

Usability Questionnaire 6/6

Explore the created policy process via the timeline

The interface successfully allows me to get a visual overview of the created policy process.

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

-2 -1 0 1 2

I intuitively knew how to use the interface

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

-2 -1 0 1 2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
The organisation and display of information through the interface is clear	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
The interface provides all the information I need.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

Final Questions

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
I am satisfied with the ease of completing the tasks in this scenario.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
I am satisfied with the amount of time it took me to complete the tasks indicated by the scenario	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
I am satisfied with the support information (online-line help, messages, document- tation) when completing the tasks.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
The system allows me to enhance the effectiveness in my job.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
Using the system in my job would enable me to accomplish tasks more quickly.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
Using the system would improve my job performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
The system has all the functions and capabilities I expect it to have.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
The terminology used in the system reflects that of my work environment.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2
	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
I would imagine that most people would learn to use this system very quickly.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2
	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree	
I would recommend this system to my colleagues.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	-2	-1	0	1	2

What is your overall impression to the system? Do think, it might help in decision-making?

List the most negative aspect(s) of the system.

List the most positive aspect(s) of the system.

How would you describe the system in one or more words?

Do you have any open questions, ideas, suggestions,...?

Thank you very much for your support!
The EU Community Project Team