



eParticipation Programme

Contract Number: EP-07-01-016

Project Full Title: CitizenScape
eParticipation in Legislation Implementation



CitizenScape

Periodic Progress Report

Jan-Jun09

| Deliverable Form | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Project Contract No. | EP-08-01-016 |
| Deliverable No. | D3.2.3.a |
| Relevant workpackage: | WP3 |
| Nature: | R (Report) |
| Dissemination Level: | RE (Restricted to a group specified by the consortium - including the Commission Services) |
| Document version: | V1.0 |
| Date: | 28 July 2009 |
| Authors: | John J O'Flaherty, MAC |
| Document description: | Project Progress Report for the period January to June 2009 |
| Reporting Period: | January - June 2009 |

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Table of Contents..... | 2 |
| 1 Publishable Executive Summary | 3 |
| 1.1 Project Objectives..... | 3 |
| 1.2 Contractors involved | 3 |
| 1.3 Coordinator contact Details | 4 |
| 1.4 Work performed & Results Achieved..... | 4 |
| 1.5 Project logo | 4 |
| 1.6 Project public website | 4 |
| 2 Project objectives & major achievements during the reporting period | 5 |
| 2.1 Objectives for the reporting period, work performed, contractors involved and the main achievements in the period..... | 5 |
| 2.1.1 WP1.1- User Requirements & Service Specification | 6 |
| 2.1.2 WP1.2 – Design & Develop CitizenScape System | 6 |
| 2.1.3 WP1.3 – Installation in the 4 User Regions..... | 6 |
| 2.1.4 WP2.1 Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 7 |
| 2.1.5 WP2.2 - Dissemination | 8 |
| 2.1.6 WP2.3 – Plans for Sustainable Operation | 9 |
| 2.1.7 WP3-Project Management | 10 |
| 3 Work package progress of the period | 12 |
| 3.1 Overview of the actions carried out in the reporting period | 12 |
| 4 Consortium Management..... | 15 |
| 4.1 Consortium management tasks and their achievement | 15 |
| 4.2 Project timetable and status..... | 16 |
| 4.3 Co-ordination activities in the period | 16 |
| 5 Other issues including the Use & Dissemination..... | 18 |
| 6 Consumed Effort..... | 20 |
| 7 Planning for the next period..... | 24 |
| Annex I: Deliverable Summaries | 25 |
| D1.2.2 -CitizenScape System running..... | 25 |
| D1.3.1 -CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Regions..... | 25 |
| D2.2.2 -CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event | 26 |
| D3.2.2 -Half-yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR2 (Jul-Dec08) | 28 |
| D3.3 -Interim Project Progress Report | 28 |
| Annex II: Risk Monitoring & Tracking Sheets | 30 |

1 Publishable Executive Summary

1.1 Project Objectives

CitizenScape - eParticipation in Legislation Implementation

CitizenScape is a citizen-driven initiative that provides tools, applications and services which empower citizens to contribute to legislative and decision-making processes and address the implementation of EU initiated legislation by Local Authorities. CitizenScape involves key stakeholders, i.e. actors from both civil society and public institutions in a shared environment that is moderated and managed by the Local Authority.

CitizenScape is integrating and testing state-of-the-art Web 2.0 social networking ICT-based tools and solutions in a socially purposeful way in concrete legislative and decision-making processes - specifically looking at engaging Citizens to debate and participate in the implementation of EU environmental legislation at a local level. It is defining the precise conditions to be fulfilled, the desires and needs expressed by citizens for collective participation in major EU issues, and the specific barriers to be overcome for deployment.

The project is, in parallel, integrating "best of breed" components into the technological solution, and has adapted the very successful Public-i webcast methodology to create a framework for recruiting citizens to CitizenScape and then moderating their inputs. From this experience it is planned that the platform and approach will be applied and contribute to other EU policies as a key driver to sustain and expand the service after the trial period. The project seeks to create a 'democratic pathway' by attracting and recruiting citizens to use the Web 2.- style space of CitizenScape and then migrating them to more formal online democratic tools (such as petitioning). These formal tools will be then the means to access the decision makers – in this case Local Councillors.

CitizenScape is unique in its combination of a strong and focused implementation methodology alongside the operational use of innovative technology. CitizenScape is a flexible online space that blends and integrates social networking and other Web 2.0 technologies with more formal online democratic tools. The Citizen eParticipation methodology has created an accessible and inclusive model for engaging citizens which ensure that CitizenScape implementations not only have effective technologies but also effective offline recruitment activities and support to guarantee that the CitizenScapes are vibrant and active democratic centres.

1.2 Contractors involved

| | | | |
|---|-------|----|--|
| 1.The National Microelectronics Applications Centre Ltd | (MAC) | IE | www.mac.ie |
| 2.Public-i Group Ltd | (PI) | UK | www.public-i.eu |
| 3.Bristol City Council | (BCC) | UK | www.bristol.gov.uk |
| 4.Comune di Genova | (CDG) | IT | www.comune.genova.it |
| 5.Donegal County Council, | (DCC) | IE | www.donegalcoco.ie |
| 6.Rozvojova Agentura Zilinskeho Samospravneho Kraja, N.O. | (RDA) | SK | www.razsk.sk |

1.3 Coordinator contact Details

Dr. John J O'Flaherty, Project Manager,

eml: j.oflaherty@mac.ie

Tel: +353-61-334699

Fax: +353-61-338500

www.CitizenScape.org

1.4 Work performed & Results Achieved

During January to June 2009, the third period of the project the focus was on the mid-project review, the Interim Dissemination Event and operation/evaluation of the Service at the 4 Regional Pilot Trials. The following deliverables were delivered:

- D1.2.2-CitizenScape System running.
- D1.3.1-CitizenScape Sys Operational in all 4 Trial Regions.
- D2.2.2 - CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event
- D3.2.2 - Half-yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR2 (Jul-Dec08)
- D3.3 - Interim Project Progress Report

1.5 Project logo



1.6 Project public website

www.citizenscape.org

2 Project objectives & major achievements during the reporting period

2.1 Objectives for the reporting period, work performed, contractors involved and the main achievements in the period

Please report your progress towards relevant objectives per WP and provide specific information on the work that each beneficiary has done

All phases of European legislation tend to be very remote from most EU citizens. So CitizenScape is focusing its work and trials on specific European Legislation and/or Directives that have an immediate impact on all local and regional Authorities across Europe. Operation of the CitizenScape service will be evaluated during 2009 in 4 very different regions, and thus determine best practice to interest and engage citizens in the implementation of such legislation at the local/regional level that is most directly and immediately relevant to their lives. As an interactive multimedia web-based service, CitizenScape complements and enhances at a regional level the vast amount of EU legislative online information and the European Parliament's own EPLive webcasting, and could provide future potential functional and citizen e-participation enhancements to that service.

The CitizenScape project focuses on the regional and local level, and addresses the legislation/legislative process at implementation (stage 3) of the four stages of European legislation:

1. the legislation proposal formation stage (e.g. by Regional Authorities and relevant institutions),
2. the debate on draft legislation (e.g. in Councils and with citizens, businesses, NGOs and other socio-economic groups),
- 3. the implementation level,**
4. the follow-up/monitoring of the legislation life cycle (e.g. amendments, impacts, etc).

The CitizenScape project is focusing on the implementation of EU Environmental legislation by Local Authorities as this is an important and tangible area of work for the Local Authority partners. The CitizenScape project gives decision makers formal comment and feedback via statutory instruments such as petitions as well as access to informal comment and discussion which should lead to a more informed debate and decision making process. Once proven during the project with environmental legislation, the CitizenScape service will be subsequently deployed to further EU legislation and policies.

The CitizenScape objectives and expected outcomes of the project are as follows:

| Objective | | Target |
|-----------|--|---|
| 1. | Increased Citizen Participation in their Regional Legislative Processes. | (a) 25% increase in citizen participation in their regional legislative processes. (b) in 4 very different legislative regions across the EU during the project. |
| 2. | Demonstration of a viable citizen led social networking site with re-useable recruitment and moderation methodology. | (a) Operation of a localised CitizenScape service in each of 4 Trial Regions. (b) Demonstration of the service scale-up potential to National and EU levels |
| 3. | Sustainable operation of the CitizenScape Service | (a) Viability Plan for subsequent sustainable operation of the service across Europe. |

2.1.1 WP1.1- User Requirements & Service Specification

Objectives

- Define the User Requirements at each of the 4 sites.
- Document specific European Legislative Processes at each of the 4 Trial Sites.
- Develop a Technical Specification of the CitizenScape System, to guide its implementation and subsequent deployment across Europe.

Work Performed (by Partners)

No work during the period, WP1.1 was completed in period 1 with the delivery of D1.1.1 (CitizenScape User & Tech Requirements for all sites)

2.1.2 WP1.2 – Design & Develop CitizenScape System

Objectives

- A complete operational CitizenScape system.

Work Performed (by Partners)

- MAC
 - Input to the completion and submission of the D1.2.2 “CitizenScape System running” report.
 - Use and investigation of Web 2.0 tools and sources. Feedback and contributions to their incorporation into the CitizenScape initial prototype.
- PI
 - Citizenscape widget layout development
 - Development of back end and administration system
 - Completion of D1.2.2 “CitizenScape System running” report.
- CDG
 - Request for PI technical specifications related to widgets to be fed from external sources. Started to set up CDG software systems to comply with that specification.
- DCC
 - Completed development of Citizenscape storyboards for system design.
- RDA
 - Final alterations to the Citizenscape system based on the requirements by the regional authorities in order to fit the selected topic of use; Input to the completion and submission of the D1.2.2 “CitizenScape System running” report.

Main Achievements.

Once the D1.2.1 (System Technical Specification) was completed in December 2008, the system was implemented and formally delivered as D1.2.2 (CitizenScape System running) in January 2009, to complete WP1.2.

2.1.3 WP1.3 – Installation in the 4 User Regions

Objectives

- CitizenScape System customised and localised to the Ireland, Italy, Slovakia & UK
- CitizenScape System operational at the 4 Trial Sites in their local languages – English, Italian & Slovakian

Work Performed (by Partners)

- MAC
 - Input to the completion and submission of the D1.3.1 "CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Regions" report.
 - Input and support to the Regional installations.
- PI
 - Citizenscape widget layout deployment.
 - Project management of all 4 pilot sites.
 - Completion of D1.3.1 "CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Regions" report.
- BCC
 - Webcasting of Sustainable Travel Select Committee.
 - Design for Citizenscape website.
 - Filming video vox pops.
 - Testing and refining the Citizenscape website.
- CDG
 - Translation of CitizenScape and Viewfinder sites hardcoded strings to allow PI implementation of local sites. Editing of CitizenScape and Viewfinder sites local pages.
 - Decisions made on personnel involved in administering and moderating the site
 - Starting of new forum on Viewfinder
- DCC
 - Installed systems to feed into the Citizenscape site for Donegal County Council and tested on web servers locally.

Main Achievements.

The 4 Regional Pilot Trial sites were installed during Dec08-Jan09, as the key outputs of this WP. WP1.3 was completed with the submission of the milestone deliverable D1.3.1 (CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Regions) in January 2009.

2.1.4 WP2.1 Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation

Objectives

- Initial service deployment and evaluation of the CitizenScape Trial service in 4 varied Legislative Authority contexts, countries and languages, as the key input to the CitizenScape Viability Plan (D2.3.2)
- Directly contribute to the Democratic Renewal and increased Citizen Legislative Engagement in those Regions, by a 25% increase in citizen participation in local legislative and democratic activities and interactions by the end of the 12 month Pilot Trials period.
- To evaluate the legislative participation impact of CitizenScape and its relationship to wider aspects of e-governance.
- To establish the varying contextual issues that need to be addressed in implementing CitizenScape in different legislative, constitutional, political and linguistic environments
- To develop lessons on implementation of CitizenScape in preparation for market roll-out to National and European levels, and other European countries.

Work Performed

- MAC
 - Ongoing inputs to the operation and evaluation of the operational trials in all 4 regions.
- PI
 - Functional specifications and definitions update for Donegal, Bristol and Zilina sites.
 - Donegal Offline Moderation Meeting: community moderators and fly tipping campaign discussion
 - Evaluation plan framework.
- BCC
 - Ongoing pilot of the Citizenscape system including community outreach, skills training, marketing, publicity, moderation and facilitation.
 - Designing training for community facilitators.
 - Working with local community groups and community facilitators.
- CDG
 - Starting to devise a thorough strategy for both improving the engagement of citizens and city legislator and having tools to monitor the overall impact over time
- DCC
 - Donegal's Pilot Trials involve working with a group young people.
 - Have linked up with the Public Health Unit of the Health Services Executive who do a lot of work with local groups. Focus is on environmental agenda.
 - Taking the activities into the schools through the Green Flag Scheme (Primary Schools). Coming from the civic amenity point of view, with a focus on fly tipping.
 - Held a Group of Youth Offline Moderation Meeting on using CitizenScape and to determine their Social Networking skills, in conjunction with Public-i, who also attended.
- RDA
 - Launching the webcasts from the regional assembly meetings using the Citizenscape system; on-going communication with user groups, selection of group moderators, consultation with Public-i regarding monitoring and evaluation criteria.

Main Achievements.

D2.1.1 "Evaluation Criteria & Pilot Trials Monitoring Plan" was delivered in July 2008, completing the first phase of WP2.1. The second intensive phase of WP2.1 began in this period with the operation and evaluation of the 4 Regional Pilot Trials.

2.1.5 WP2.2 - Dissemination

Objectives

- Increased Legislative eParticipation awareness and the central importance of engaging citizens in all eGovernment legislative services and initiatives.
- CitizenScape Service awareness, particularly in the 4 Trials Countries (UK, IE, IT, SK)
- Promotional materials, website and two dissemination workshops.

Work Performed

- MAC
 - Attendance on the CitizenScape Stand at the European eParticipation Day in Brussels on 5 March 2009. See section 4.
 - Attendance at the Interim Dissemination Event “Web 2.0 Innovation in Local Government” in Zilina on 2 April 2009, as well as production and delivery of D2.2.2 - CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event.
 - Ongoing generation and maintenance of content for the project website at www.citizenscape.org.
 - Presentation of the project at various meetings as shown in section 4.
- PI
 - Pre-meeting and Interim Review Meeting, Brussels, BE
 - European eParticipation Day, Brussels
 - eParticipation concertation meeting, Brussels
 - Citizenscape Interim Dissemination event in Zilina, Slovakia
 - Virtual Town Hall white Paper.
- BCC
 - Preparation for and attendance at dissemination event in Zilina on 2nd April 2009.
- CDG
 - Dissemination to people internal to CDG to have further support in different departments especially underlining the differences among the CitizenScape goals and tools compared to other social networking tools
 - Started a network marketing strategy to spread the information among category of citizen (first step young people)
- DCC
 - Attended and presented at Citizenscape Interim Dissemination event in Zilina, Slovakia
 - Briefings with Information Systems staff to highlight project progress.
- RDA
 - Organization of the dissemination workshop at the conference Innovative Development of Regions held at Žilina, Slovakia. Preparation and presentation of the RDA participation in the Citizenscape project at the workshop.

Main Achievements

Deliverable D2.2.2 (CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event) was completed and submitted during the first period. The project is working actively with the MOMENTUM support action.

2.1.6 WP2.3 – Plans for Sustainable Operation

Objectives

- The Initial CitizenScape Viability plan (in Month 6). This will elaborate on the ideas described here based mainly on the results coming from WP1.1 and WP1.3 to be tested by the Pilot Trials in WP2.1.
- The Final Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation of the CitizenScape Service (D2.3.2) to deploy the CitizenScape system across Europe, and to National and European legislative process levels, as the major output of this project.

Work Performed

- MAC
 - Ongoing review and updating of the Initial Viability Plan and assumptions based on early feedback from the Pilot Trials operation of the service in the 4 regions, to lead up to the Final Viability Plan due at the end of the project.
 - A table of contents and initial content was developed for D2.3.2 (Final CitizenScape Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation) due in December 2009.
- PI
 - Pilot trial Virtual Town Hall meeting with various Councils: B&H, Chorley District, Birmingham, Lincoln, New Castle
- RDA
 - Model of renting the webcasting kit discussed and tried with the Business Partner in Slovakia.

Main Achievements

The D2.3.1 (Initial Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation) was completed and submitted in June 2008. This ended the first phase of WP2.3. D2.3.2 (Final CitizenScape Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation) will mark the end of the project in December 2009.

2.1.7 WP3-Project Management

Objectives

- an effective and efficient project that will facilitate the CitizenScape project to achieve its objectives.
- All Contractual deliverables and progress reports delivered on time.
- All Coordinator responsibilities and liaison with the Commission and Consortium concluded as per contract

Work Performed

- MAC
 - Completion and submission of the D3.2.2-Half-Yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR2 (Jul-Dec08) and the D3.3 - Interim Project Progress Report.
 - Preparation, attendance and presentation at the Interim Project Review in Brussels on 30 Jan. See section 4.
 - Attendance at the MOMENTUM Concertation Meeting in Brussels on 5 Mar 09.
 - Preparation and attendance at the Fourth Project Board and Executive Meeting at Zilina, Slovakia on 1 April 2009, in conjunction with the Interim Dissemination Event there, on 2 April. See section 4.
 - Preparation for the Fifth Project Board and Executive Meeting to be held in Brussels on 14-15 July 2009.
- PI
 - Completion of Half-Yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR2 (Jul-Dec08)
- BCC
 - Preparation for and attendance at Project Board meeting in Zilina on 1st April
- CDG
 - Completion of project reports with regard to our local activities
 - Started preparation for hosting the 9 September meeting in Genova
- DCC
 - Input to HMR2 (Jul-Dec08) and the D3.3 - Interim Project Progress Report
 - Preparation and attendance at the Fourth Project Board and Executive Meeting at Zilina, Slovakia on 1 April 2009
 - Maintenance and completion of costs, and time sheets.
 - Ongoing internal project management meetings with IT staff.
- RDA
 - Inputs for D3.2.2-Half-Yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR2 (Jul-Dec08) and the D3.3 - Interim Project Progress Report
 - Preparation and participation at the pre-review meeting, interim project review meeting, PEC4 and PPB4; preparation for PEC5 and PPB5.

Main Achievements.

- A very effective and efficient Project Policy Board and Executive Committee meeting was held in Zilina.
- Successful Interim Project Review in Brussels on 30 Jan
- The 5 scheduled deliverables were completed and submitted during the period.
- The consortium is working very effectively and well together.
- The project objectives are being achieved.

3 Work package progress of the period

3.1 Overview of the actions carried out in the reporting period

| 3.1.1. Overview of progress and results against objectives per Main Activity | |
|--|--|
| <i>Describe concrete results (factual information, not generic descriptions) relevant to original objectives for each of the following Main Activities : Project Management, User Requirements Analysis & Design, Platform Implementation/Integration, Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results , Dissemination & Promotion</i> | |
| Main Activity | Progress within the reported Period |
| Project Management | The consortium is working very effectively and well together. The project objectives are being achieved, and all scheduled deliverables were completed and submitted during the period. A very effective and efficient Project Policy Board and Executive Committee meetings were held. |
| User Requirements Analysis & Design | Completed in Year 1. |
| Platform Implementation | The CitizenScape System prototype systems were installed in January 2009 and are now running at all 4 sites. |
| Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results | Operation and evaluation of the 4 Regional Pilot Trials is taking place as planned throughout 2009. |
| Dissemination & Promotion | The project has participated in many events and is working very actively with the MOMENTUM Support Action. The D2.2.2 Interim Dissemination Event took place in Zilina, Slovakia on 2 April 2009. The CitizenScape Initial Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation was developed and completed. Its assumptions will now be tested in the Pilot Trials leading to the Final CitizenScape Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation at the end of the project in December 2009. |

| 3.1.2. Deliverables, their status and critical assessment of delay if any. | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Please list the deliverables per main activity</i> | | | | |
| Main Activity | Del. No-Title | Planned delivery date¹ | Actual delivery date² | Status /Notes/ Explanation of deviations (if any) |
| Project Management | D3.2.2-Half-yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR2 (Jul-Dec08) | Jan09 | Jan09 | |
| | D3.3-Interim Project Progress Report | Jan09 | Jan09 | |
| User Requirements Analysis & Design | | | | |
| Platform Implementation | D1.2.1-CitizenScape First Prototype & System Technical Specification. | Jun08 | Dec08 | <i>Due to its fundamental importance to the project, this was not finalised until formal agreement by all Partners at the PEC3 Meeting in December 2008</i> |
| | D1.2.2-CitizenScape System running. | Sep08 | Jan09 | <i>This followed on from D1.2.1.</i> |
| Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results | D1.3.1-CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Regions. | Dec08 | Jan09 | <i>This also followed on from D1.2.1. The CitizenScape service is currently completing internal testing at the 4 Pilot Site and will be publically operational on 30 January 2009, just one month behind the original schedule.</i> |
| Dissemination & Promotion | D2.2.2-CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event | Dec08 | Apr09 | <i>It was agreed that this would be part of the Žilina Regional Innovation Conference, which has been put back to April 2009.</i> |

¹ dd/mm/yy

² dd/mm/yy

3.1.3. Milestones, their status and critical assessment of delay if any.

Please list the related milestones of the reported period per main activity

| Main Activity | Milestone No-Title | Planned achievement date ³ | Actual achievement date ⁴ | Status /Notes/ Explanation of variance (if any) |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Project Management</i> | | | | |
| <i>User Requirements Analysis & Design</i> | | | | |
| <i>Platform Implementation</i> | MS1: CitizenScape Operational in 4 Regions | Dec08 | Jan08 | The CitizenScape Service is running at all 4 trial sites, which is the Interim Milestone of the project. |
| <i>Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results</i> | | | | |
| <i>Dissemination & Promotion</i> | | | | |

3.1.4. Issues, deviations and corrective actions per Main Activity

Describe issues or problems that might affect achievement, delay activities, deliverables or milestones for each of the following Main Activities: **Project Management, User Requirements Analysis & Design, Platform Implementation, Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results, Dissemination and Promotion of project results.** Also, describe corrective actions and solutions applied in order to solve the matter!

| Main Activities | Issues | Deviations from the initial plan | Corrective Actions |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <i>Project Management</i> | None | | |
| <i>User Requirements Analysis & Design</i> | Took longer than planned. | Spent more time to reach formal agreement. | No impact on project. |
| <i>Platform Implementation</i> | Took longer than planned. | Spent more time in finalising Prototype. | Completion of Interim Milestone put back one month. |
| <i>Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results</i> | Slight delay in startup. | One month later than planned due to longer platform Implementation. | All 4 Pilot Systems implemented and commissioned in parallel. |
| <i>Dissemination & Promotion</i> | Interim Dissemination Event | Host conference put back to April 2009. | Had more useful Trial results at that time. |

³ dd/mm/yy

⁴ dd/mm/yy

4 Consortium Management

This section should summarise the status of the project and its management activity including information on:

4.1 Consortium management tasks and their achievement

Consortium management tasks and their achievement; problems which have occurred and how they were solved. Beneficiaries: comments regarding contributions, changes in responsibilities and changes to consortium itself, if any.

The consortium is working very effectively and well together. There have been no changes in responsibilities nor changes to consortium itself. No significant problems, that will affect the achievement of the objectives of the project, have been encountered

- The on-going project coordination continued as established at the beginning of the project.
- Five deliverables were finalised and submitted to the Commission using the process specified in the D3.1 Handbook. The process was found to work well and efficiently.
- The first project review took place in Brussels on 30th January 2009, and the D3.3 - Interim Project Progress Report was prepared and submitted for that.
- The Fourth Project Board and Executive Meeting took place in Zilina in April 2009 to consider the project review, and in conjunction with the D2.2.2 (CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event) that was also held there.
- The Fifth Project Board and Executive Meeting will take place in Brussels on 14-15 July 2009.

4.2 Project timetable and status

| 4.2.1. Schedule attainment | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Main Activity | Start month – End Month ⁵ | Current Status ⁶ | % of ⁷ completion |
| Project Management | Jan08-Dec09 | In-Progress | 75-100%, |
| User Requirements Analysis & Design | Jan08-Jun08 | Complete | 100% |
| Platform Implementation | Feb08-Sep08 | Complete | 100% |
| Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results | Oct08-Dec09 | In Progress | 50-75%, |
| Dissemination & Promotion | Jan08-Dec09 | In Progress | 50-75% |

4.3 Co-ordination activities in the period

| 4.3.1. Project Meetings during the reported period | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Nature of meeting ⁸ | Place | Date |
| PPB4/PEC4 Plenary Management Meetings | Zilina, SK | 1 Apr 09 |
| PPB5/PEC5 Plenary Management Meetings | Brussels, BE | 14-15 Jul 09 |

| 4.3.2. Collaboration activities with other projects | | |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Please list the collaboration actions performed with other projects</i> | | |
| Projects Involved | Type of Collaboration activity ⁹ | Results from collaboration Activity |
| MOMENTUM | Joint dissemination events. | Exhibition at the European eParticipation Day, 4 th March. |
| EuroPetition | Joint dissemination event; meeting; exchange of deliverables; circulation of material; know-how transfer; synergies identified | Allowing CitizenScape to build on its experience and findings, and disseminate to its partners & at its meetings. |
| FEED | Joint dissemination event; meeting; exchange of deliverables; circulation of material; know-how transfer; synergies identified | Allowing CitizenScape to build on its experience and findings, and disseminate to its partners & at its meetings. |
| eParticipate | Joint dissemination event; meeting; exchange of deliverables; circulation of | Allowing CitizenScape to build on its experience and findings, and disseminate to its partners & at its |

⁵ As per DoW

⁶ Started; In-Progress; Completed

⁷ Choose one from : (0-25)%, (25-50)%, (50-75)%, (75-100)%

⁸ Negotiation, kick-off, technical, plenary, management board meeting, other

⁹ Joint dissemination event; meeting; exchange of deliverables; circulation of material; know-how transfer; synergies identified, other (if any, please specify)

| | | |
|----------------|--|---|
| | material; know-how transfer; synergies identified. | <i>meetings.</i> |
| <i>DemoNET</i> | Circulation of material, meeting, know-how transfer. | <i>Joined DemoNet Network, links & events information on website.</i> |
| <i>PepNET</i> | Circulation of material, meeting, know-how transfer. | <i>Information sharing, links & events information on website.</i> |

5 Other issues including the Use & Dissemination

This section should briefly summarise project's executed dissemination activities for the period.

| 5.1. Dissemination activities performed in the period | | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Describe dissemination activities performed during the period, incl. Actual dates, Activity, Type of audience, Countries addressed, Size of audience, Feedback collected (if any)</i> | | | | | |
| Actual Date | Type of Activity¹⁰ | Type of Audience¹¹ | Size of audience | Countries addressed | Feedback collected |
| 03/02/09 | Regional Authority Office Department Heads Meeting | Research & practitioners. | 25 | Žilina, SK | |
| 3/02/09-4/02/09 | Presentation to EuroPetition Meeting. | Research & practitioners. | 20 | London, UK | |
| 12-02/09 - 13/02/09 | Presentation to eParticipate Meeting and User Groups. | Research & practitioners. | 40 | Segovia, ES | |
| 13/02/09 | Regional Authority Office Department Heads Meeting | Research & practitioners. | 25 | Žilina, SK | |
| 18/02/09 | Web 3.0 Venture Academy Meeting | Research & practitioners | 40 | Brussels, BE | |
| 4/3/09 | Exhibition Stand at European eParticipation Day | MPs, MEPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens. | 150 | Brussels, BE | |
| 5/3/09 | MOMENTUM Concertation Meeting | Research & practitioners | 15 | Brussels, BE | |
| 10/03/09 | Regional Authority Office Department Heads Meeting | Research & practitioners | 25 | Žilina, SK | |
| 17/03/09 | Regional Assembly Meeting | MPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens. | 50 | Žilina, SK | |
| 2/04/09 | Interim Dissemination Workshop Presentations at Regional Innovation Conference. | MPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens. | 200 | Zilina, SK | |
| 23/04/09 | Regional Assembly Meeting | MPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens. | 50 | Žilina, SK | |
| 8/05/09 | Presentation to MidWest Regional Authority staff | Research & practitioners | 15 | Nenagh, IE | |
| 11/05/09 | Regional Authority Office Department Heads Meeting | Research & practitioners. | 25 | Žilina, SK | |
| 14/05/09 - 15/05/09 | Presentation to eParticipate Meeting and Users Group. | Research & practitioners | 50 | Elancourt, FR | |
| 27/05/09 | Regional Authority Office Department Heads Meeting | Research & practitioners | 25 | Žilina, SK | |

¹⁰ Conference, Workshop, Publications,, Brochure, Electronic Newsletter; Press Releases; Whitepaper; Other (if any please specify)

¹¹ MPs, MEPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens; other (if any please specify)

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|-----|-------------|--|
| 16/06/09 | Commercialising EU Results. | Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens. | 100 | Dublin, IE | |
| 23/06/09-24/06/09 | Presentation at EuroPetition Meeting. | Research & practitioners. | 20 | Malaga, ES | |
| 26/06/09 | INSPIRE Meeting | Research & practitioners | 15 | Dublin, IE | |
| 30/06/09 | Irish EU Projects meeting | Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens. | 50 | Dublin, IE | |
| 9/07/09 | Facilitators Workshop | Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens. | 20 | Bristol, UK | |
| <p><i>If MEPs and MPs are participating in your events, please specify names, committees which are involved, areas of interest</i></p> | | | | | |
| <p> </p> | | | | | |

6 Consumed Effort

| 6.1. Estimation of consumed PMs / WP in the period per partner | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Partner: 1 - MAC | | | |
| Work-package No | Workpackage title | Planned Effort (person-months) | Actual Effort (person-months) |
| 1.1 | User Requirements & Service Specificaiton | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.2 | Design & Develop CitizenSpace System | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| 1.3 | Installation in the 4 User Regions. | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| 2.1 | Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 1.9 | 0.5 |
| 2.2 | Dissemination | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| 2.3 | Plans for Sustainable Operation. | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| 3 | Project Mgt, Coord & Liasion with EU | 2.0 | 4.3 |
| Total | | 6.3 | 6.7 |

| 6.1. Estimation of consumed PMs / WP in the period per partner | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Partner: 2 - PI | | | |
| Work-package No | Workpackage title | Planned Effort (person-months) | Actual Effort (person-months) |
| 1.1 | User Requirements & Service Specificaiton | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.2 | Design & Develop CitizenSpace System | 0.7 | 3.0 |
| 1.3 | Installation in the 4 User Regions. | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| 2.1 | Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 3.1 | 1.7 |
| 2.2 | Dissemination | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| 2.3 | Plans for Sustainable Operation. | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| 3 | Project Mgt, Coord & Liasion with EU | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| Total | | 6.4 | 7.2 |

| 6.1. Estimation of consumed PMs / WP in the period per partner | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Partner: 3 - BCC | | | |
| Work-package No | Workpackage title | Planned Effort (person-months) | Actual Effort (person-months) |
| 1.1 | User Requirements & Service Specificaiton | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.2 | Design & Develop CitizenSpace System | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| 1.3 | Installation in the 4 User Regions. | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| 2.1 | Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 1.6 | 3.8 |
| 2.2 | Dissemination | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| 2.3 | Plans for Sustainable Operation. | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 3 | Project Mgt, Coord & Liasion with EU | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Total | | 3.0 | 4.3 |

| 6.1. Estimation of consumed PMs / WP in the period per partner | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Partner: 4 - CDG | | | |
| Work-package No | Workpackage title | Planned Effort (person-months) | Actual Effort (person-months) |
| 1.1 | User Requirements & Service Specificaiton | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.2 | Design & Develop CitizenSpace System | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| 1.3 | Installation in the 4 User Regions. | 0.3 | 2.2 |
| 2.1 | Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 2.7 | 1.0 |
| 2.2 | Dissemination | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| 2.3 | Plans for Sustainable Operation. | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 3 | Project Mgt, Coord & Liasion with EU | 0.2 | 1.6 |
| Total | | 3.8 | 6.1 |

| 6.1. Estimation of consumed PMs / WP in the period per partner | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Partner: 5 - DCC | | | |
| Work-package No | Workpackage title | Planned Effort (person-months) | Actual Effort (person-months) |
| 1.1 | User Requirements & Service Specificaiton | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.2 | Design & Develop CitizenSpace System | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 1.3 | Installation in the 4 User Regions. | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| 2.1 | Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 2.7 | 1.8 |
| 2.2 | Dissemination | 0.3 | 1.0 |
| 2.3 | Plans for Sustainable Operation. | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| 3 | Project Mgt, Coord & Liasion with EU | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Total | | 3.9 | 3.8 |

| 6.1. Estimation of consumed PMs / WP in the period per partner | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Partner: 6 - RDA | | | |
| Work-package No | Workpackage title | Planned Effort (person-months) | Actual Effort (person-months) |
| 1.1 | User Requirements & Service Specificaiton | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 1.2 | Design & Develop CitizenSpace System | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| 1.3 | Installation in the 4 User Regions. | 0.6 | 0.0 |
| 2.1 | Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 3.6 | 3.1 |
| 2.2 | Dissemination | 0.7 | 3.2 |
| 2.3 | Plans for Sustainable Operation. | 0.2 | 0.9 |
| 3 | Project Mgt, Coord & Liasion with EU | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| Total | | 5.7 | 8.0 |

| 6.2. Cumulative Effort for the project | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Work-package No | Workpackage title | Planned Effort (person-months) | Actual Effort (person-months) |
| 1.1 | User Requirements & Service Specificaion | 10.6 | 8.7 |
| 1.2 | Design & Develop CitizenSpace System | 20.2 | 19.8 |
| 1.3 | Installation in the 4 User Regions. | 16.0 | 10.1 |
| 2.1 | Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | 21.8 | 19.1 |
| 2.2 | Dissemination | 8.7 | 15.5 |
| 2.3 | Plans for Sustainable Operation. | 4.0 | 5.5 |
| 3 | Project Mgt, Coord & Liasion with EU | 8.2 | 17.8 |
| Total | | 89.5 | 96.5 |

| 6.3. Estimated vs consumed PMs / Main activity in the reporting period | | |
|---|---|--|
| Main activity | Estimated PMs for the period (person-months) | Effort consumed in the period (person-months) |
| <i>Project Management</i> | 3.1 | 7.7 |
| <i>User Requirements Analysis & Design</i> | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| <i>Platform Implementation</i> | 2.0 | 3.9 |
| <i>Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results</i> | 18.8 | 15.4 |
| <i>Dissemination & Promotion</i> | 5.5 | 9.1 |
| Total | 29.4 | 36.1 |

7 Planning for the next period

| 7.1. Planned activities concerning the work for the next period | |
|---|--|
| Main Activity | Planned activities for the next period |
| Project Management | <i>The project will continue to address its objectives and meet its contractual commitments. The HMRs and Final Reports will be produced.</i> |
| User Requirements Analysis & Design | <i>None.</i> |
| Platform Implementation | <i>In line with its Web 2.0 approach the CitizenScape service will continue to improve and evolve based on its users' feedback and suggestions.</i> |
| Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results | <i>The CitizenScape Pilots will continue to be operated and evaluated as specified in the Evaluation Plan. The Final Evaluation Report will be produced. The Final CitizenScape Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation will be developed and agreed.</i> |
| Dissemination & Promotion | <i>The CitizenScape dissemination will continue and be intensified in line with the pilot trials as defined in the Dissemination Plan, with the highlights being the Interim and Final Dissemination Events.</i> |

| 7.2. Planned activities concerning the dissemination and promotion for the next period | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Planned Date | Type of the dissemination activity ¹² | Targeted Audiences ¹³ | Countries addressed | Expected Size of audience |
| 7-9/09/09 | <i>Presentation at EDEM2009 Conference</i> | <i>MPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens.</i> | <i>Vienna, AT</i> | <i>200</i> |
| 20-21/10/09 | <i>Presentation at SOLACE Conference</i> | <i>MPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens.</i> | <i>Brighton, UK</i> | <i>200</i> |
| 17/11/09 | <i>Pre-Ministerial eGovernment Conference</i> | <i>MPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens.</i> | <i>Malmo, SE</i> | <i>100</i> |
| 25/11/09 | <i>CitizenScape Final Dissemination Workshop at Future Democracy 09</i> | <i>MPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens.</i> | <i>London, UK</i> | <i>250</i> |

¹² Conference, Workshop, Publications,, Brochure, Electronic Newsletter; Press Releases; Whitepaper; Other (if any please specify)

¹³ MPs, MEPs, Research & practitioners; NGOs; citizens; other

Annex I: Deliverable Summaries

D1.2.2 -CitizenScape System running.

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Project | CitizenScape |
| Del. Number | D1.2.2 |
| Del. Title | CitizenScape System running |
| Related WP | WP1.2 |
| References | |
| Abstract | <p>This report describes the operational CitizenScape System as a follow-on from D1.2.1 (Technical Specification) describing the prototype site that was developed. The report explains the system that has been developed and the theory behind it.</p> <p>The prototype described in D1.2.1 is complete and being tested and validated. The next phase of the process involves the User Partners working with their stakeholders to agree on the descriptions of how the sites will be implemented. This phase of making the system operational is not just about the technology and the applications that will be used, but about winning the hearts and minds of those involved.</p> <p>One of the central tenants of the CitizenScape project is the use of existing Web 2.0 content where possible in order to emphasise the idea that the CitizenScape sites are co-created with Stakeholders.</p> <p>Before the actual sites are completed, the stakeholders (alongside the User Partners) must decide on the specific content that will be pulled in from other sources, putting the Web 2.0 element of the sites at the fore.</p> <p>This report explains the basic system that sits behind the regional user sites.</p> |
| Related Keywords | System, Prototype. |
| Key Results | CitizenScape Prototype system. |

D1.3.1 -CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Regions.

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Project | CitizenScape |
| Del. Number | D1.3.1 |
| Del. Title | CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Region |
| Related WP | WP3 |
| References | |
| Abstract | <p>This deliverable outlines the phases of the installation of the CitizenScape sites in the 4 regions. It is split into two strands of work – the technical and the social – while each User Partner requires a site (CitizenScape container), this can only be completed once the social element (interaction, consultation and buy-in from stakeholders) of the installation has taken place.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>Each site requires a website that will act as the portal for a number of citizen engagement tools (set out in the technical specification – D1.2.1), known as widgets. The widgets will be used to engage citizens on a single issue in that region. This document highlights these issues and the methods through which they will be addressed – in terms of technology and media.</p> <p>Each of the User partner sites' URLs are:</p> <p>Bristol: www.bristol.CitizenScape.public-i.tv Donegal: www.donegal.CitizenScape.public-i.tv Zilina: www.zilina.CitizenScape.public-i.tv Genoa: www.genoa.CitizenScape.public-i.tv</p> <p>These sites will be activated on 30 January 2009 after completion of their testing and validation. This report presents an overview of the user partners' sites including wireframe pictures of the layout and content of each site.</p> |
| Related Keywords | Service, operational system. |
| Key Results | MS1 of the Project. CitizenScape System Operational in all 4 Trial Region |

D2.2.2 -CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Project | CitizenScape |
| Del. Number | D2.2.2 |
| Del. Title | CitizenScape Interim Dissemination Event |
| Related WP | WP2.2 |
| References | |
| Abstract | <p>This report documents the interim dissemination event of the CitizenScape project which was held in Žilina, Slovakia, on 2nd April 2009. The workshop was part of the Žilina 2009 Regional Innovation Conference and centred on "Web 2.0 Innovation in Local Government". This document contains notes of and the presentations made at the workshop, as well as the agenda and other relevant information.</p> |
| Related Keywords | Dissemination, Zilina |
| Key Results | <p>This report documents the interim dissemination event of the CitizenScape project which was held in Žilina, Slovakia, on 2nd April 2009. The workshop was part of the Žilina 2009 Regional Innovation Conference and centred on "Web 2.0 Innovation in Local Government". This report contains notes of and the presentations made at the workshop, as well as the agenda and other relevant information.</p> <p>This workshop prompted lively participation and very effectively disseminated the CitizenScape service and project within Slovakia and increased support to the project in the Žilina region in particular. The meeting attracted over 53 delegates from across Slovakia and Europe.</p> |

Social networking is one of the greatest areas of internet usage and CitizenScape seeks to exploit and harness this within a democratic context in a socially purposeful way in concrete legislative and decision-making processes at 4 very different Local Authority sites across Europe.

There is much practical and very useful experience and lessons to be learned from the various workshop presentations and discussions.

Conclusions that can be drawn from the workshop are:

- The conference focus on the need for, and immediate benefits of, regional innovation, complemented the innovative CitizenScape approach to engaging citizens to participate in their local democracy. As the future is about more democratisation of the generation of ideas, services such as CitizenScape typifies and will help with that. The conference attendees ensured a very pragmatic and hands-on approach.
- In relation to innovation and Žilina regional development, CitizenScape is innovative and relevant to use the Internet in new ways to enable new business models, and in these difficult times it is important for citizens to participate even more in their local democratic processes.
- Councils have a very positive experience of using the CitizenScape service. Overall there was no objection or disagreement with the CitizenScape approach. Local Authorities can definitely use Web 2.0 tools and social networks to improve the engagement of their citizens.
- The aim of the CitizenScape project is to come up with generic and repeatable approaches that can be applied in all regional governance. It has to be flexible, make government “digitally native” and allow co-creation, i.e. working with citizens as partners, to engage a whole generation who have grown up in the Information Age.
- Web 2.0 is a new field which is developing rapidly as people try to make sense of what is happening. It is almost a state of mind – a new approach. But public agencies are not using these – their tone is too formal – social networks need to be engaging and “fun”.
- To enable citizen engagement and empowerment, CitizenScape provides a platform and an organising framework to combine the informal (engagement of people) and the formal (making better democratic decisions).
- The EU project endorsement, sharing of best practice and funding have been very important in encouraging the take-up of the CitizenScape approach and service in the individual regions.

These conclusions suggest that the following needs to be done by Local Authorities to effectively use Web 2.0 and engage their citizens in the take-up of services such as CitizenScape in their regions:

- 1 Web 2.0 and Social Networking is a very dynamic and evolving area, so local government organisations have to get involved and evolve with that. In doing so, such organisations need to be aware that:
 - a) Public content should be public
 - b) Context is important
 - c) Consider their tone
 - d) Establish traceability
 - e) Think about what behaviour they want to encourage
 - f) Individuals need to be accountable.

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>g) Debate is important wherever it happens</p> <p>h) Any moderation must be done in conjunction with citizens and if at all possible by citizens.</p> <p>i) Social networks need to be engaging and “fun”.</p> <p>2 In using the CitizenScape, or any Web 2.0 framework, Local Authorities need to plan, organise and continuously evaluate:</p> <p>a) The shifting balance between Online and Offline activities</p> <p>b) The need to balance Accessibility for all with the Practicality of using new technologies for the majority of people</p> <p>c) The Conflict between Communication and Consultation</p> <p>d) The balance between</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • formal democracy as organised by the Local Authority and informal participation appearing in Social Networks • direct democracy within Web 2.0 and the existing representative democracy • Control of content and increased citizens’ involvement |
|--|---|

D3.2.2 -Half-yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR2 (Jul-Dec08)

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Project | CitizenScape |
| Del. Number | D3.2.2 |
| Del. Title | Half-yearly Monitoring Report 2 – HMR1 (Jul-Dec08) |
| Related WP | WP3 |
| References | |
| Abstract | <p>In this second period of the project the focus was on developing, completing and installing the CitizenScape service and procedures at the 4 user sites, and preparing for the mid-project Review. The following deliverables were delivered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D1.2.1-CitizenScape System Technical Specification. • D2.1.1-Evaluation Criteria & Pilot Trials Monitoring Plan • D3.2.1-Half-Yearly Monitoring Report 1 – HMR1 (Jan-Jun08) |
| Related Keywords | Progress Report |
| Key Results | Progress Report |

D3.3 -Interim Project Progress Report

| | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Project | CitizenScape |
| Del. Number | D3.3 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Del. Title | Interim Project Progress Report |
| Related WP | WP3 |
| References | |
| Abstract | <p>During the first of its 2 years, the project Partners researched the CitizenScape System user requirements, documented the project's dissemination and evaluation plans, developed an initial viability plan (to sustain the service after the project ends), designed and developed the prototype CitizenScape Service (which can be viewed at http://demo.citizenscape.public-i.tv) and is currently completing commissioning of the service in the 4 pilot use sites in Bristol (UK), Donegal (Ireland), Genoa (Italy) and Zilina (Slovakia), for the Pilot Trials that will be undertaken throughout 2009.</p> |
| Related Keywords | Interim Progress Report, Mid-Project |
| Key Results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Project Management</i>-The consortium is working very effectively and well together. The project objectives are being achieved, and all scheduled deliverables were completed and submitted during the period. Three very effective and efficient Project Policy Board and Executive Committee meetings have been held. • <i>User Requirements Analysis & Design</i>-The CitizenScape User & Technical Requirements for all sites were researched, agreed and completed. • <i>Platform Implementation</i>-The CitizenScape System First Prototype and System Technical Specification was agreed and completed, and the CitizenScape System prototype system was developed and is now running. • <i>Pilots / Evaluation of Project Results</i>-The CitizenScape Service is running at all 4 trial sites, which is the Interim Milestone of the project. The CitizenScape Evaluation Criteria & Pilot Trials Monitoring Plan was developed. The CitizenScape evaluation plans was developed, and operation and evaluation of the 4 Regional Pilot Trials will take place throughout 2009. • <i>Dissemination & Promotion</i>-The CitizenScape Dissemination Strategy was agreed and completed. The project has participated in many events and is working very actively with the MOMENTUM Support Action. The CitizenScape Initial Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation was developed and completed. Its assumptions will now be tested in the Pilot Trials leading to the Final CitizenScape Viability Plan for Sustainable Operation at the end of the project in December 2009. |

Annex II: Risk Monitoring & Tracking Sheets

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------|
| Risk ID¹⁴: | R1.1 | Related WP / activity | WP1.1 - User Requirements & Service Specification | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator¹⁵: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | Findings come back negative for a Web 2.0 eParticipation service on European Legislation. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | High impact as this is the main point of the project. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)¹⁶ | 3 – critical | Probability¹⁷ | 1 - low | Risk exposure¹⁸ | High |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | This is unlikely given the UK & LEGESE experience, but the situation will be analysed to understand why and the platform will be appropriately refocused. | | | | |
| Status¹⁹ | Monitored | | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | |
| Comments: Trials are evaluating this key risk. | | | | | |
| Closing date²⁰: 31/12/09 | | | Approval²¹: John J O'Flaherty | | |

¹⁴ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

¹⁵ Name, organisation

¹⁶ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

¹⁷ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

¹⁸ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

¹⁹ Identified, Monitored, Contained

²⁰ Date when related activity is completed

²¹ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Risk ID²²: | R1.2 | Related WP / activity | WP1.2 - Design & Develop CitizenScape System | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator²³: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | Better existing systems may be found. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | Medium Impact as we could use the better systems. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)²⁴ | 3 – critical | Probability²⁵ | 2 Medium | - | Risk exposure²⁶ Low |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | The CitizenScape platform is made up of "best of breed" applications and Web 2.0 omponents, so if better solutions are found, they will be incorporated into the eParticipation system | | | | |
| Status²⁷ | Monitored | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | | |
| Comments: | Trials are evaluating this issue. | | | | |
| Closing date²⁸: | 31/12/09 | | Approval²⁹: Catherine Howe | | |

²² In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

²³ Name, organisation

²⁴ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

²⁵ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

²⁶ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

²⁷ Identified, Monitored, Contained

²⁸ Date when related activity is completed

²⁹ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Risk ID³⁰: | R1.3 | Related WP / activity | WP1.2 - Design & Develop CitizenScope System | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator³¹: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | Scope of requested customisation may be much larger than expected and beyond the scope of the project. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | Unlikely as the project is using available Web 2.0 tools. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)³² | 3 – critical | Probability³³ | 1 - Low | Risk exposure³⁴ | Low |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | Customisation and selection of Web 2.0 tools will be focused on the core Legislative eParticipation needs to keep the system simple and stay within budget and scope of the project | | | | |
| Status³⁵ | Contained | | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | |
| Comments: | CitizenScope system is now operational so this is unlikely to be a problem. | | | | |
| Closing date³⁶: 31/12/08 | | | Approval³⁷: Catherine Howe | | |

³⁰ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

³¹ Name, organisation

³² 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

³³ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

³⁴ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

³⁵ Identified, Monitored, Contained

³⁶ Date when related activity is completed

³⁷ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Risk ID³⁸: | R1.4 | Related WP / activity | WP1.2 - Design & Develop CitizenScape System | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator³⁹: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | CitizenScape System may not operate reliably. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | High impact as this is critical for the service to be acceptable. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁴⁰ | 3 – critical | Probability⁴¹ | 1 - low | Risk exposure⁴² | Low |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | Only proven Web 2.0 components and applications are being integrated in CitizenScape to mitigate against this. | | | | |
| Status⁴³ | Contained | | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | |
| Comments: | Trials will prove the systems reliability | | | | |
| Closing date⁴⁴: | 31/12/09 | | Approval⁴⁵: | Catherine Howe | |

³⁸ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

³⁹ Name, organisation

⁴⁰ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁴¹ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁴² High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁴³ Identified, Monitored, Contained

⁴⁴ Date when related activity is completed

⁴⁵ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---------|---|
| Risk ID⁴⁶: | R1.5 | Related WP / activity | WP1.3 - Installation in the 4 User Regions. | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator⁴⁷: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | It may not be possible to install the Legislative eParticipation system in all 4 Pilot Sites. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | Low impact as this would just reduce the value of the trials. Unlikely as Web 2.0 tools are widely available and used. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁴⁸ | 2 - marginal | Probability⁴⁹ | 2 Medium | - | Risk exposure⁵⁰ High |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | There will be close liaison between the partners, prior and during this task to resolve any issues that might arise to delay or preclude installation in a specific site. | | | | |
| Status⁵¹ | Contained. | | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | |
| Comments: Service is now operational in all 4 regions, so this is not an issue | | | | | |
| Closing date⁵²: 31/12/08 | | | Approval⁵³: Catherine Howe | | |

⁴⁶ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

⁴⁷ Name, organisation

⁴⁸ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁴⁹ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁵⁰ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁵¹ Identified, Monitored, Contained

⁵² Date when related activity is completed

⁵³ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Risk ID⁵⁴: | R2.1 | Related WP / activity | WP2.1 - Pilot Trials, Monitoring & Evaluation | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator⁵⁵: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | Evaluation may not be useful | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | High impact as this is a key point of the project. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁵⁶ | 2 - Marginal | Probability⁵⁷ | 1 - low | Risk exposure⁵⁸ | Medium |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | The focus of the project from day one, is on an evaluation of the CitizenScape system to determine if initial assumptions that underlie it are valid. So only useful evaluation in that context will be undertaken. Agreement and ongoing liaison | | | | |
| Status⁵⁹ | Monitored | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | | |
| Comments: | Evaluation of the Trials is addressing this. | | | | |
| Closing date⁶⁰: | 31/12/09 | | Approval⁶¹: | Catherine Howe | |

⁵⁴ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

⁵⁵ Name, organisation

⁵⁶ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁵⁷ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁵⁸ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁵⁹ Identified, Monitored, Contained

⁶⁰ Date when related activity is completed

⁶¹ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Risk ID⁶²: | R2.2 | Related WP / activity | WP2.2 - Dissemination | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator⁶³: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | Ongoing dissemination may take more effort and resources than planned. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | Not a big impact on the core objectives of the project. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁶⁴ | 2 - Marginal | Probability⁶⁵ | 1 - low | Risk exposure⁶⁶ | Low |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | Continuous on-line liaison between the partners and with the Commission will ensure that this does not occur. | | | | |
| Status⁶⁷ | Contained | | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | |
| Comments: | Not proving to be a problem so far, especially as we work with MOMENTUM. | | | | |
| Closing date⁶⁸: | 31/12/09 | | Approval⁶⁹: | Keith Young | |

⁶² In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

⁶³ Name, organisation

⁶⁴ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁶⁵ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁶⁶ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁶⁷ Identified, Monitored, Contained

⁶⁸ Date when related activity is completed

⁶⁹ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------|
| Risk ID⁷⁰: | R2.3 | Related WP / activity | WP2.3 - Plans for Sustainable Operation. | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator⁷¹: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | The WP2.1 analysis may indicate that a viable CitizenScape business model is unlikely. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | High impact as this is a key point of the project. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁷² | 1 - critical | Probability⁷³ | 2 - Medium | Risk exposure⁷⁴ | High |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | Intense discussions will be undertaken amongst the partners to come up with a viable and sustainable model. The WP2.1 Trials and evaluation will be refocused to address this and test its assumptions. | | | | |
| Status⁷⁵ | Monitored | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | | |
| Comments: | This is a key issue in the ongoing evaluation of the trials & will be addressed in D2.3.2 Final Viability Plan P | | | | |
| Closing date⁷⁶: | 31/12/09 | | Approval⁷⁷: | John J O'Flaherty | |

⁷⁰ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

⁷¹ Name, organisation

⁷² 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁷³ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁷⁴ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁷⁵ Identified, Monitored, Contained

⁷⁶ Date when related activity is completed

⁷⁷ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------|
| Risk ID⁷⁸: | R2.4 | Related WP / activity | WP2.3 - Plans for Sustainable Operation. | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator⁷⁹: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | The results from the trials may indicate that the Final Viability Plan assumptions are not valid or the system is not viable. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | High impact as this is a key point of the project | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁸⁰ | 1 - Critical | Probability⁸¹ | 2 - Medium | Risk exposure⁸² | High |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | The evaluation will focus on validating the assumptions for sustainable operation. If these prove that pan-European deployment of the system is not viable, then partners will work with the partner local authorities to ensure that their needs are met within this Trial Project. | | | | |
| Status⁸³ | Monitored | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | | |
| Comments: | This is a key issue in the ongoing evaluation of the trials. | | | | |
| Closing date⁸⁴: 31/12/09 | Approval⁸⁵: John J O'Flaherty | | | | |

⁷⁸ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

⁷⁹ Name, organisation

⁸⁰ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁸¹ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁸² High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁸³ Identified, Monitored, Contained

⁸⁴ Date when related activity is completed

⁸⁵ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Risk ID⁸⁶: | R3.1 | Related WP / activity | WP3.3 - Administration, Project coordination & EU Liaison | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator⁸⁷: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | Project management may require more effort and time than planned. | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | Not a big impact on the core objectives of the project. | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁸⁸ | 2 - Marginal | Probability⁸⁹ | 1 - low | Risk exposure⁹⁰ | Low |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | Continuous on-line liaison between the partners and with the Project Officer to ensure that this does not occur. | | | | |
| Status⁹¹ | Monitored | Status Date: | 3/07/09 | | |
| Comments: | Is not proving to be a problem so far. | | | | |
| Closing date⁹²: 31/12/09 | Approval⁹³: John J O'Flaherty | | | | |

⁸⁶ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

⁸⁷ Name, organisation

⁸⁸ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁸⁹ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁹⁰ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁹¹ Identified, Monitored, Contained

⁹² Date when related activity is completed

⁹³ WP Leader

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------|
| Risk ID⁹⁴: | R3.2 | Related WP / activity | WP3.3 - Administration, Project coordination & EU Liaison | | |
| Date Identified: | 01/07 | Originator⁹⁵: | O'Flaherty, MAC | | |
| Risk Statement: | The partners may not be able to reach agreement on a Consortium Agreement | | | | |
| Actual / Potential Impact on the Project: | High impact on the project consortium | | | | |
| Effect (Level of Impact)⁹⁶ | 3 - critical | Probability⁹⁷ | 1 - low | Risk exposure⁹⁸ | High |
| Proposed solution / Mitigation strategy | This is currently being completed early in the project to ensure that the IPR issues are agreed & resolved before significant new IPR is created. | | | | |
| Status⁹⁹ | Contained | | Status Date: | 11/03/08 | |
| Comments: Consortium Agreement was signed by all Partners. Did not prove to be a problem. | | | | | |
| Closing date¹⁰⁰: 31/03/08 | | | Approval¹⁰¹: John J O'Flaherty | | |

⁹⁴ In the form Ri.j where i=WP number and j=1,...n. Example R3.1 is Risk Nr 1 for WP3.

⁹⁵ Name, organisation

⁹⁶ 4—uncontrollable, 3—critical, 2—marginal, 1—negligible

⁹⁷ 3— high, 2— medium, 1— low

⁹⁸ High, Medium, Low, as per table in Section

⁹⁹ Identified, Monitored, Contained

¹⁰⁰ Date when related activity is completed

¹⁰¹ WP Leader