

# Demos@Work

Enable European-wide discussion between elected representatives and civil society

Project EP-07-01-035

---

## D4.2 - Success Criteria Report

---

Responsible: Gov2u  
Contributors: Scytl, NTUA, GFI  
Document Reference: D4.2  
Dissemination Level: PU  
Version: 01  
Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> December 08



## Executive Summary

Demos@Work is a project co-financed under the 2007 eParticipation call which aims at designing, implementing and validating an integrated solution for facilitating European-wide discussion between elected representatives and civil society in all the European Union countries. A public health issue was selected for this trial project, more specifically, the harmful effects of smoking. Nevertheless, other policy areas/ topics will also be explored, such as communication/ EU policy.

The whole process will be driven by a diverse set of trial applications that capture the challenges of materializing the vision of a citizen-elected representative collaborative environment. The same software systems will be used as trial applications in order to validate and demonstrate the benefits of the approach. The National Parliament of Lithuania and the Regional Parliament of Catalonia were selected to test the technical solution. For the trial, Demos@Work will be kept as a separate site from the dedicated sites of the Lithuanian Parliament and Catalanian Parliament, but will be linked to from therein.

Using already-created ICT-based eParticipation and eGovernment tools, we integrated them in such a way that will allow the participating parliaments to manage a single platform both for interacting with the citizens and allowing collaborative efforts between their MPs, facilitating training and maintenance requirements. MPs using the system will be able to directly access and use the information gathered from the citizens and processed by the system, in order to use in their deliberations and law-making processes. MPs will also be able to initiate different citizen participation processes by themselves, subject to approval by the parliament supervisor before going 'public'.

Citizens will be able to see the issues that are currently under debate through the Demos@Work platform. By selecting an issue, they will be able to access related legal information (opinions and interpretations expressed by representatives and experts, draft legal documents, etc.) and to express their opinion on the selected issue. They will be able to request the inclusion of different issues in the law-making process, may it be directly (through petitions), or indirectly (by the 'automatic' semantic interpretation of their comments in forums and blogs). Parliamentary personnel involved in the trials will be responsible for engaging citizens in the discussion, and to give MPs the incentive to participate. They will moderate the participation tools that allow citizens to express their opinions on the issues under discussion and will support the work of MPs while using Demos@Work.

More specifically, the end users will be divided in two groups, the members of the Elected Representatives User Group and the Citizens User Group.

Members of the Elected Representatives user group can be one of the following user categories:

- Members of the Regional Parliament of Catalonia
- Members of the National Parliament of Lithuania
- Members of the European Parliament
- Members of public authorities or agencies involved in the public health policy from Catalonia and Lithuania
- Operational staff of the Parliaments of Catalonia and Lithuania

Members of the Citizens user group can be one of the following user categories:

- Citizens of Catalonia in Spain and citizens of Lithuania

- Associations and Unions of citizens and enterprises
- Doctors, consultants and experts on the public health sector
- Researchers
- Members of NGOs
- Representatives from the tobacco industry, restaurants and bars etc.

Some of the initial benefits that the Parliaments expect from the application of Demos@Work within their Parliament are the following:

1. More direct participation of the citizen in the political debate, reaching representatives more easily.
2. A flow of ideas and opinions for the representatives to work with.
3. Increased public awareness of the legislative process.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
I.1. Purpose of the document .....	5
I.2. Scope and content of the deliverable.....	5
I.3. Intended Audience.....	6
I.4. Relation with other deliverables/Work Packages.....	6
<b>II. TEST CASE SCENARIOS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
II.1. Introduction.....	8
II.2. Test case scenario for Lithuanian Parliament.....	8
II.3. Test case scenario for the Catalonian Parliament .....	8
<b>III. DEMOS@WORK INITIAL SUCCESS CRITERIA .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>IV. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS FOR THE TRIALS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
IV.1. Introduction .....	11
IV.2. Factors .....	12
IV.2.1. Assemblies must be ready to recruit their user panels .....	12
IV.2.2. Use technically competent staff .....	13
IV.2.3. User involvement, support and acceptance.....	13
IV.3. Measure, Monitor and Track .....	14
<b>V. RISK ASSESMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>VI. METRICS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VII. REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VIII. ANNEX.....</b>	<b>21</b>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The report is a deliverable of the WP4: “**Requirements and Results Analysis - Assessment of Costs and Benefits of the Project’s Outcomes**”.

### I.1. Purpose of the document

The purpose of this report is to define both qualitative and quantitative elements that will be used as the basis for the final assessment of the project’s results. In more detail, the report presents parameters to be measured and metrics which will clearly demonstrate and assess the impact and benefits of Demos@Work. This deliverable is released for a public audience.

The report is a deliverable of WP4: “Requirements and Results Analysis. Assessment of Costs and Benefits of the Project’s Outcomes” and it is produced within the Task 4.2. - Assessment Instruments and Critical Success Factors.

The objective of the WP4 “Requirements and Results Analysis - Assessment of Costs and Benefits of the Project’s Outcomes” is to evaluate Demos@Work deliverables from both a technological and sociological perspective. In other words, the aim is to assess and document benefits, drawbacks and critical success factors. Once the trial applications are almost stabilised (thanks to previous test executions), this work package will firstly ensure their actual use beyond the sample of end-users earlier involved in tests. It will also evaluate the added value and impact of the Project tools in the trial environments. In this way, it will address training and awareness creation, actual use and monitoring of the applications by a large group of users and will benefit evaluation.

Within Task 4.2, success criteria for the project have been identified and documented that will serve as a basis for creating the acceptance tests. These success criteria are included in the present report.

### I.2. Scope and content of the deliverable

The main sections of this report are outlined below:

1. The first section of the report presents the scope of the report and its relation with other deliverables and work packages of the project
2. The second section of the report presents an overview of the aims, objectives, end-user groups, test case scenarios and initial plans regarding success criteria of the Demos@Work project.
3. The third part of the report describes the critical success factors (CSF) that were taken into account in planning the trails. The focus is on critical success factors that will ensure that the pilots will provide useful feedback on the acceptability of Demos@Work from users. These CSF are:
  - Assemblies must be ready to recruit their user panels
  - Use technically competent staff
  - User involvement, support, and acceptance
4. The fourth section presents an assessment of the risks that could threaten the successful implementation of the trials.
5. The fifth section of the report presents the metrics (qualitative and quantitative) and the key performance indicators (KPIs) for each of the metrics.

Finally, references are given in the last section of the report.

### I.3. Intended Audience

Since this is a public audience deliverable we should explain who could be interested in reading this document (list of potential ‘readers’) and why they should read it.

Intended audience	Their possible interest
Representatives of Parliaments involved in the trail (MPs, IT and administrative staff)	To be aware about the success factors and to support their fulfillment
The Advisory Board composed of the MEPs	Knowing the success criteria and the KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) that are planned for this project they could better advise the project team and actively take part in the deliberations
The evaluators of the project (the 3 independent experts active in the eParticipation sector)	In order to assess the benefits of the project the evaluators must be informed about the metrics and KPIs that were planned for the project for its succes.
Representatives of other Parliaments	They can be interested to read this document in case that they are attracted of the idea of the project and maybe intend to exploit it in the future.
Personnel involved in e-Participation projects	This document coul be a source of inspiration for them in drawing their own success criteria report for the projects that they implement or intend to implement in the future.
General public	All those who are interested in general in e-participation project and initiatives could be interested to read this document in order to find more information about the planning of such initiatives.

### I.4. Relation with other deliverables/Work Packages

This deliverable is related to WP 2- Demos@Work Platform because the success of the project depends first of all on the development of a functional application that later on will be tested to demonstrate and measure the impact and benefits of the project.

End-user consultation at an earlier stage in the project implementation process is considered necessary. It remains of major importance to determine whether the end-user for whom the application has been initiated will accept it and contribute to the success of the project. In our case, the end-users were already involved in the application design by identifying high-level user requirements and presented within deliverable D4.1 - User Requirements Report. That is why this deliverable is interrelated with the D4.1; On one hand, the user involvement is a success critical factor and, on the other hand, the parameters to be measured are related to the user requirements.

At the same time, the dissemination activities developed within the WP 5 - Dissemination and Institutional Exploitation are important for the overall success of the project to attract a large amount of users. For this reason, WP5 is also related to this deliverable, which defines the critical success factors for the demonstration phase.

Success factors and metrics to demonstrate the impact and benefit of Demos@Work are referring to the trial activities and the trial scenarios selected to test the technical solution. That means that this deliverable is related to WP2-Trial Applications since it provides the complete vision for starting the trials and all activities planned for the trial application phase that are described in Task.3.2.

A forthcoming deliverable, the D4.3 Methodology Report, which will be submitted during month 12 of the project, will present the instruments, methods and approaches to be used to gather data in order to measure the impact and benefits of Demos@Work. Another

forthcoming deliverable is D4.3 Basic Platform Trials' Demonstration Evaluation which will present the first evaluation of user satisfaction after the beginning of the demonstration phase. Finally, deliverable D 4.6 - Trials' Demonstration Assessment Report, which is planned for Month 24, will assess the actual impact of the application on the leading entity, evaluated through several perspectives:

- Evolution of the satisfaction of end-users on the quality of the results provided by the system thanks to the project features (the baseline being measured at the beginning of the demonstration phase);
- Evolution of the performance supported by the trial application as defined by managers of the trial's leading entity and measured independently of Demos@Work (typically through their own management indicators)
- Satisfaction of the managers from these entities

All these forthcoming reports will take into account the metrics and the key performance indicators identified within this deliverable.

## II. TEST CASE SCENARIOS

### II.1. Introduction

Within the deliverable “D3.1 - Trial Scenarios Definition” our team has designed similar test case scenarios for both trial locations, based on a real situation and trying to encompass all the functionalities of Demos@Work. The test is based on a story about how Demos@Work will be used, including information about the motivations of the people involved. A test scenario provides an end-to-end check on a benefit the project is supposed to deliver.

The test case scenarios present citizens using the platform (public discussion forum, blogs, virtual debates) and MPs understanding the information by using public discussion forums, restricted forum and other classification tools.

### II.2. Test case scenario for Lithuanian Parliament

We will encourage participation of members of the Lithuanian Parliament associations and organizations related to the issue and of the general public.

Bar and restaurant owners have been made aware of the existence of the Demos@Work project through the Parliament’s dissemination activities. They want to raise public awareness of the situation of their associates and influence the representatives to achieve a change in the law.

The discussion thread proposed by the MPs on Citizens Front End is visited and commented on by different categories of people such as bar-owners, health experts and normal customers. After some time, the opinions are systematized using semantic technologies and the results sent to the members of the Health Affairs Committee.

The representative who first brought up the issue writes in the public forum informing citizens that the Health Affairs Committee is working on the matter. This provokes a new round of arguments and ideas from citizens interested in the issue.

Different arguments and replies are made within the Committee discussion forum. New ideas are brought in from the public forum using semantic technologies. To help them reach a decision, the Committee members make use of argument visualization technology. Finally a consensus is reached and a proposal for amendments to the law is drafted.

The representative appears again in the public forum to inform people of the law amendment, and to thank everybody for their contribution.

Through Demos@Work, MPs are enabled to tap citizen opinions and debates so as to better understand their requirements in different areas.

### II.3. Test case scenario for the Catalanian Parliament

We will encourage participation of members of the Catalanian Parliament (through the involvement of the Committee of Health) and other assemblies such as the European Parliament, associations and organizations related to the issue, and of the general public.

The current Spanish law that regulates public smoking forbids smoking in all workplaces. However, it generally allows bar and restaurant owners to decide whether or not to permit smoking on their premises. This creates the paradox wherein those employees who deal with customers are exposed to tobacco smoke in their workplace.

The Bar and Restaurant Workers Section of the Labour Union has been made aware of the existence of the Demos@Work project through the Parliament’s dissemination activities.

They want to raise public awareness to the situation of their associates and influence the representatives to achieve a change in the law.

The discussion thread proposed by the MPs on Citizens Front End is visited and commented on by different categories of people such as waiters, bar-owners, health experts and normal customers. After some time, the opinions are systematized using semantic technologies and the results sent to the members of the Health Committee of the Parliament.

One of the representatives of the Health Committee considers that the subject deserves further study. He uses the Demos@Work search facilities to look for relevant documentation in the Parliament's database and opens a discussion in the Committee's workspace for the matter. After some discussion among members of the Committee, the Committee chairman opens a poll among Committee members who are willing to discuss a possible amendment to the law.

The Committee members vote remotely on the poll and a decision is made to go ahead. They open another discussion and invite a number of European Parliament members from various parties to join in.

The representative who first brought up the issue writes in the public forum informing citizens that the Health Committee is working on the matter. This provokes a new round of arguments and ideas from citizens interested in the issue.

Different arguments and replies are made within the Committee discussion forum. New ideas are brought in from the public forum using semantic technologies. To help them reach a decision, the Committee members make use of argument visualization technology. Finally a consensus is reached and a proposal for amendments to the law is drafted.

The representative returns once again to the public forum to inform people of the law amendment, and to thank everybody for their contribution.

### III. DEMOS@WORK INITIAL SUCCESS CRITERIA

This section summarizes the initial success criteria for Demos@Work as described in the project proposal and relating to the demonstration phase.

The success criteria plan related to the Trial Activities and Assessments that was established at the beginning of the project implementation contains the following success criteria:

1. Successful trial of the Demos@Work portal in the Regional Parliament of Catalonia and the Lithuanian Assembly with the involvement of **at least 2 parliamentary committees from each one as well as at least 3 other public authorities or agencies involved in public health policy.**
2. Specific **usability tests** done during the trials in order to ensure that users are able to use the eParticipation tool properly and that it addresses citizens' needs.
3. **At least 20 different stakeholders and EU decision-makers** contribute to the platform;
4. **At least 15 summaries of discussions** on pre-selected issues concerning public health and especially smoking policy are forwarded to relevant decision-makers at national and European levels;
5. **Highlight of legislative document**, in which sections have been added or modified as a result of the platform's contribution;
6. User questionnaire showing support for the platform and its usefulness.
7. **Approximately 15,000-25,000 users** from among citizens and politicians are expected to participate actively in the project with **an average of about 140-250 per week.**
8. Involvement of **at least 11 EU MPs** in the assessment of benefits and analysis of results.
9. Direct **involvement of eDemocracy experts** in the evaluation of sociological results and real added value of the project.

## IV. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS FOR THE TRIALS

### IV.1. Introduction

The concept of "success factors" was developed by D. Ronald Daniel of McKinsey & Company in 1961. In literature, several definitions of critical success factors (CSF) exist. Representing one of the most frequently cited definitions, Rockart (1979) defined CSF as *"the limited number of areas in which results, if they are satisfactory, will ensure successful competitive performance for the organization,"* while Pinto and Slevin (1987) define CSF as *"factors which, if addressed, significantly improve project implementation chances."*

In some cases the researchers tried to link project success to different project stages i.e. delivery and post delivery stages.

The CSF method and the analysis of CSFs are used in many ways outside of IT planning. In their research on the use of CSFs in federal government program management, James Dobbins and Richard Donnelly [Dobbins 98] identify uses of CSFs to

- identify the key concerns of senior management
- assist in the development of strategic plans
- identify key focus areas in each stage of a project life cycle and the major causes of project failure
- evaluate the reliability of an information system
- identify business threats and opportunities
- measure the productivity of people

The term "critical success factor" has been adapted for many different uses. Familiarity with the term is often presented in the context of a project or an initiative (i.e., the CSFs for the implementation of an ICT system or application deployment). In this context, CSFs describe the underlying or guiding principles of an effort that must be regarded to ensure that it is successful. Within this report, we define CSF as elements that, if addressed, significantly improve the chances of a successful implementation of the Demos@Work application in real-life. In this context, CSFs are more than just guiding principles; instead, they are considered an important component of a strategic plan that must be achieved in addition to the project's goals and objectives.

To perform a CSF method, this information is formed into statements that represent the activities that should be carried out. Project review and interviews with consortium members and other stakeholders involved in project implementation provide the basic raw data for deriving CSF. As a result, the main CSFs considered in this section are as follows:

1. Assemblies must be ready to recruit their user panels
2. Use of Technically competent staff
3. User involvement, support, and acceptance

Usually, the success criteria for trial projects fall into the following categories:

- System performance
- User satisfaction
- Project goals

Success can be measured by providing documented evidence of methods that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the trial's progress from multiple points of view: functional, technical, risk management, and client satisfaction.

The performance measures for the trials are:

- **Functional Quality** refers to the quality or correctness of the features/functions of the Demos@Work application delivered as a result of the project. Functional quality can be measured using the number of change requests made, approved, and effectively implemented or the number of critical, serious, and non-critical defects outstanding and resolved during the trial.
- **Technical Quality Performance** refers to the technical infrastructure that provides the foundation for the delivery of Demos@Work. In the case of Demos@Work, indicators such as system availability, downtime, problem resolution, response time and utilization of the applications by the users will measure technical quality performance.
- **Issue Management Performance** refers to the identification and resolution of issues or exceptions that are impacting the successful delivery of the project. Issues can be related to communications, human resources, Demos@Work features and functions etc. The purpose of issue management is to ensure that all matters requiring resolution, decisions or direction are addressed as soon as possible to avoid negative consequences on project objectives and deliverables.
- **Client Satisfaction Performance** includes client perceptions on the achievement of various aspects such as implementation, support and with the results obtained by using the Demos@Work application.

## IV.2. Factors

### *IV.2.1. Assemblies must be ready to recruit their user panels*

The Demos@Work services are focused on committee work. The pilot aims to involve members of committees, and enquire into how the services may support their pre- and post-meeting work. Therefore, approval of the assembly authorities that govern committee work is necessary if committee members are to be formally involved in the pilots. Each assembly reports below on the relevant authorities and the approximate time when their approval will be sought.

**For both parliaments**, involvement of the Committees requires their agreement, and particularly of the spokespersons of each Parliamentary Group involved in the Committees. The approval of the Presiding Board of the Parliament is also needed.

It is highly desirable to have the active involvement in each assembly's user panel of members of **at least 2 of the assembly committees**. Given the time pressures on committee business, a realistic alternative is to involve assembly staff that advise or support committees, to play the roles that members would perform in practice. Of course the assembly staff members are also sought for their own knowledge and experience of the working practices that the system must effectively support or usefully change.

Staff representation includes specialists from non-IT departments that could be stakeholders in the successful deployment of Demos@Work beyond the trial phase.

**For the Catalanian Parliament** pilot, we will try to involve:

- Members of the Committee for Young People's Policies (20-25 representatives)
- Members of the Health Commission (20-23 representatives)

- Archivists from the Documentation Department.
- Parliamentary Management Department
- Legal Department personnel

At the same time, **3 public authorities or agencies that are involved in public health policy** will also be encouraged to participate in the trial:

- The National Ministry of Health,
- The Public Health Agency of Catalonia
- The Catalan Institute of Health Studies

**For the Lithuanian Parliament** pilot, we will try to involve:

- Members of the Health Affairs Committee
- The National Health Board (advisory body to the Parliament)
- The Senior Advisor to the Committee
- Personnel from the Indexing Group and IT Departments

At the same time, **3 public authorities or agencies from Lithuania involved in public health policy** will also be encouraged to participate in the trial:

- The Ministry of Health,
- The National Health Education and Promotion Centre,
- The Lithuanian Health Information Centre

#### ***IV.2.2. Use technically competent staff***

The personnel of the parliaments involved in the trial should be trained to use the new tool so as to support MPs in using Demos@Work. The personnel who will be trained will be selected among those with good knowledge and experience in IT software, such as IT Department personnel. These personnel will assist MPs in using Demos@Work, and will moderate the participation tools that allow citizens to express their opinions on the discussion topics. They will be responsible of engaging new citizens in the discussion, and to motivating MPs to participate.

#### ***IV.2.3. User involvement, support and acceptance***

The focus of this project is mainly on citizens and politicians. It is important for the overall success of the project to attract a large amount of users. Thus, extensive marketing campaigns will be carried out. Not only internet campaigns and links will be used, but more importantly citizens will be addressed directly. Users (citizens and elected representatives) need to understand why they need to use Demos@Work system. The members of the consortium are well-experienced in conducting campaigns on EU affairs and will be constantly working on embedding the platform into the system of decision-making in the EU and will be responsible for the incorporation of decision-makers, policy-makers as well as both regional stakeholders and content-related specialists. Moreover, synergies with other similar activities are envisaged. In a nutshell, a wide range of targeted marketing measures will be carried out in order to reach a high level of public participation.

End-user consultation at an earlier stage in the project implementation process, it remains of major importance to determine whether the end-user for whom the application has been initiated will accept it. In our case, the end-users were already involved in the application

design by identifying of high-level user requirements and this will contribute to the user acceptance of the Demos@Work application and also to the user satisfaction with the functionality of the application. This analysis of user high-level requirements was done by applying questionnaires among 40 members of the Lithuanian and Catalonian Parliaments and 214 citizens of Lithuania and Catalonia.

Between December 18<sup>th</sup> 2008 and January 18<sup>th</sup> 2009 there will be invited 50 representatives of public institutions, NGOs, private companies to pre- test the usability of the available features of the platform and to express their opinion about the performance and perceived usefulness of the platform, suggestions to improve its functionality, look and feel. After testing the platform they will receive through e-mail a questionnaire of evaluation (please refer to Annex 1) that they should fill in and sent it back to us. Furthermore semi structured phone interviews will be conducted in order to gauge stakeholders opinion.

In every step of the aforementioned activities guidelines and scientific results from other EU projects like eGovMonnet and Momentum project will be taken into consideration.

User acceptance can be defined as the demonstrable willingness within a user group to employ information technology for the tasks it is designed to support. Davis et al (1989) in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) predict that user acceptance of any technology is determined by two factors: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Perceived usefulness is defined as the degree to which a user believes that using the system will enhance his or her performance. Perceived ease of use is defined as the degree to which the user believes that using the system will be free from effort. According to TAM, both perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use have a significant impact on a user's attitude toward using the system.

At the same time, the users need support in using the different features of the portal. The MPs will be supported by the parliament's personnel that will be trained on using the new tool. For the citizens interface will be developed a guide for using the application. Furthermore, the technical partners of the project Consortium will continuously provide a technical help desk service to parliaments, so they can solve any technical issues related to Demos@Work.

Finally, it must be shown to the citizens that their engagement matters by informing them of the outcomes of their online participation.

### **IV.3. Measure, Monitor and Track**

Once Demos@Work goes live, we must measure, monitor, and track the system's effectiveness with an eye to continuously improving performance. We must also survey the users to determine the impact of Demos@Work on users' attitudes and behaviour. At the same time, user feedback and evaluation are important in helping to incorporate improvements in the Beta versions. Performance should be reviewed against both initial and final baselines. Any variance between the Alpha version and Beta version of the Demos@Work application needs to be identified and justified. The review seeks to identify procedures and user requests that should be fed back into the project planning processes to improve project performance.

Performance measures describe how success in achieving the project's goals will be measured and tracked. They help with decision-making, resource allocation, and progress reporting. They are critical to communicating the overall success of the project.

Examples of methods used to collect performance information include:

- A Risk Management System to track the identification and resolution of risks
- A Bug Reporting System to provide information on application errors and their resolution.

- Periodic User Satisfaction Survey aimed to discovering what people think and feel about using Demos@Work so as to assess the perceived quality of use and the evolution of user satisfaction during the demonstration phase.
- Usage monitoring
- Direct user feedback

Documentation of all methods used and user responses that have been attempted will provide to specifically measure the success of trials. Formal evaluation reports, minutes of consortium meetings, user survey analysis, web metrics and crawlers, and internal administrative records will be included with other documentation. By the end of the project it is intended that there will be a traceable documented path from conception to conclusion.

More details about the methods used to collect performance information, the assessment instruments and approach used will be defined in the **Deliverable D.4.3 Methodology Report**.

Finally, we should report the results of the monitoring to all those who have a stake in the Demos@Work application. This “closes the loop” and allows them to make adjustments as necessary, according to user requests. That is why a test report will be created and will include the results obtained from different user acceptance tests, including data related to the system performance and the monitoring or tracking system used.

## V. RISK ASSESMENT

Every project has risks associated with it. Risks have the potential to cause the project to run over budget, increase development time, or threaten a successful implementation within the user community. If risks are known upfront, they can be planned for, managed, and often eliminated. By creating contingency plans, risks that cannot be eliminated can at least be managed. The unknown risks are the hardest to deal with since they often present themselves at the least opportune time.

In this section we will describe the known risks associated with the executions of the trials. Risk management should be conducted to determine if the demonstration phase is achieving the expected results. Special attention will be given to Risk Assessment and Management during the whole period of executing the trials in both locations. That means that special consideration will be paid to analyzing and identifying all potential and actual risks. An approach to formally identify, assess and mitigate program-level risks throughout the life of the program is chosen. Risks will be actively monitored and reported. Program-level risks will be defined by all project members. Risks will be ranked from 1 (high) to 5 (low), the ranking is based on impact on the project and likelihood of occurrence. All risks will be managed actively: Rank 1 risks must be evaluated continuously and reported to the coordinator. For all identified risks, efficient contingency plans (resource reallocation, fall-back, contingency measures) will be implemented immediately.

In the following, a preliminary list of risks and contingency measures is presented. This list will be continuously revised during the execution of the trials:

Risk	Rank	Contingency
<i>A trial organization leaves the project.</i>	1	If the departing partner is a trial organization, the Demos@Work management would try to increase the involvement of the Advisory Council and the help of other trials (including shifting of budget), so that trial feedback and opinions are still present to sufficient extent.
<i>A technical partner leaves the project</i>	4	From a technical and scientific point of view, we believe the project is internally capable of redistributing the work by the remaining partners. From a management point of view, this would require a variable effort for the remaining partners to cover the missing resources.
<i>The technical integrations get sidetracked</i>	3	Short telephone conferences between the technical partners and the coordinator will take place twice a month, where each technical partner gives a status including: achievements, problems, other issues, forecast. Internal deadlines within the consortium are set well before the EU deadlines. Also names and contact information of responsible people are collected from each partner, reminders will be sent to relevant persons before and after the deadlines.
<i>The developed solution will not be taken-up by users and policy makers because the subject chosen for the project, smoking, although having a real impact in Lithuanian and Catalan society, is not the most current issue and public</i>	4	The detailed plan to generate stakeholder buy-in through an extensive awareness raising campaign and the existing channels of communication of our regional project partners should help to minimise this risk. Furthermore, The Advisory Board composed of 3 members of the European Parliament will actively take part in the deliberations and could facilitate the involvement of other MEPs in the trial.

<i>interest may be lacking.</i>		
<i>Small response from the public due to the technical complexity i.e. lack of user-friendliness of the online platform</i>	3	In this case modification of the platform's technical features becomes necessary - e.g. as a response to end-user requests. Either a respective set of new technical features will be implemented or technical features which do not correspond to the platform's intended function or the end-users' requirements, may be removed.
<i>Technology integration and end user involvement</i>	4	The project is both technology oriented and user driven. Therefore, the project team will take care that any new technology developed within its activity receives positive feedback from users at any stage of the trial.
<i>Project not having the sponsorship of top management of user organisations</i>	4	This risk, in relation to trial environment, has been tackled by selecting trials already committed and with concrete plans for which Demos@Work would be a key element. Moreover, the institutional Exploitation activities of Demos@Work in WP5, will enable reaching an extensive number of potential user organisations and selecting the most interested ones for conducting additional trials.
<i>Project facing technology replacement issues</i>	3	Decision--making Process Improvement by ICT, Automatic Knowledge Understanding and Management and Semantic Technologies are all developing at rocket speed, and it is difficult to foresee their evolution. For this reason, the project will be engaged in a continual technology watch effort which will last until the very end of the trial.

## VI. METRICS

Metrics provide very specific 'success criteria' for projects, allowing the outcomes to be assessed at the end of implementation. In order to gain the greatest benefit from the Demos@Work application we must identify the performance metrics and measure how the system affects those metrics. Metrics are used in conjunction with KPIs (Key Performance Indicators), sometimes called key success indicators that are quantifiable measurements used to gauge the benefits of a project. A KPI then, is simply a metric that is tied to a target. Most often a KPI represents how far a metric is above or below a pre-determined target. The use of KPIs will provide the project with objective criteria against which it can be measured.

In conclusion, metrics are used as a benchmark to measure success. In our case, for the trials, the metrics selected are:

- Quantitative metrics that describe the solution's performance, including response time and defects.
- Qualitative metrics that describe client satisfaction with the solution, including ease of use, look and feel, etc.
- User Value/Satisfaction that describes the user's satisfaction with how the project team performed, including how quickly the team responded to problems, how well they communicated, how well they partnered, etc.

These metrics will be related to the following dimensions: information quality, system quality, service quality, use, user satisfaction and perceived net benefit.

Taking into account the critical succes factors defined above and revising the intial plans regarding the succes criteria for the trials together with the project partners, we propose the following metrics that will clearly measure and demonstrate the benefits of Demos@Work:

CSF	Metric	Metric Category	KPI
Assemblies must be ready to recruit their user panels	Number of committees that agree to be involved in the trial	Quantitative	2 committees per Parliament
	Number of public institutions involved in the trial	Quantitative	At least 3 public institutions per Region
Use technically competent staff	Number of referents trained	Quantitative	At least 6 for each Parliament
	Number of referents involved in the trial	Quantitative	At least 6 for each Parliament
Users involvement, support and acceptance	Number of users involved in the trial (Absolute Unique Visitors )	Quantitative	At least 15,000-25,000
	Number of citizen visits (Returning visitors vs. New visitors)	Quantitative	Between 45,000-75,000 (1:2)
	Number of registered users among citizens	Quantitative	At least 2000
	Number of parliamentarians and parliamentary staff involved in the trial	Quantitative	At least 20 MPs for each parliament
	Number of representatives of public institutions	Quantitative	At least 20

Number EU MPs involved in the trial	Quantitative	At least 11
Session duration - Average amount of time that users spent on the site each time they visited	Quantitative	At least 5 minutes/visit
Number of citizens visiting per week	Quantitative	Average 200-300 per week
Number of EU MPs involved in the assessment of project results	Quantitative	3
Number of eDemocracy experts involved in the assessment of project results	Quantitative	3
Number of summaries of discussions on pre-selected issues concerning public health and especially smoking policy that will be forwarded to relevant decision-makers at national and European levels;	Qualitative (Participation)	Minimum 15
Number of policy drafts available Online	Qualitative (Openness)	Minimum 1 per Parliament
Percentage change in user satisfaction survey/ Improvement in user satisfaction survey	Qualitative (performance)	At least 20% increase of user satisfaction
Overall user satisfaction with the Demos@Work application in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- look and feel</li> <li>- structure of content</li> <li>- reliability</li> <li>- usability (ease of use )</li> <li>- navigation</li> <li>- response time</li> <li>- search and retrieval</li> <li>- security</li> <li>- easy-to-understand content</li> </ul>	User Value/Satisfaction	Minimum 80% of users are satisfied
User Satisfaction with Project Team in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effective handling of problems identified by users regarding the Demos@Work functionality</li> <li>- Training provided</li> <li>- User documentation provided</li> </ul>	User Value/Satisfaction	Minimum 80% of users are satisfied
Users opinion on Demos@Work usefulness – if it meets user needs	User Value/Satisfaction	Minimum 80% of users agree that Demos@Work is useful
Users overall satisfaction with the Demos@Work platform	User Value/Satisfaction	Minimum 80% of users are satisfied

## VII. REFERENCES

- Agarwal, N., Rathod, U. (2006), "Defining 'success' for software projects: an exploratory revelation", International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 24 No.4, pp.358-70.
- Cem Kaner , James Bach , Bret Pettichord (2001), Lessons Learned in Software Testing
- Chan, A., Scott, D., Lam, E. (2002), "Framework of success criteria for design/build projects", Journal of Management in Engineering, Vol. 18 No.3, pp.120-8.
- Chee-Chuong Sum and James S. K. Ang (1997), Contextual Elements Of Critical Success Factors In MRP, Production and Inventory Management Journal, Falls Church, Third Quarter,
- Daniel, D. R. (1961). Management Information Crisis. In: Harvard Business Review, 111-116. Lim, C., Mohamed, M. (1999), "Criteria of project success: an exploratory re-examination", International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 17 No.4,
- Per V, Jenster, (1985), Monitoring critical success factors across selected business strategies, ACM
- Pinto, J. and Prescott, J. (1988). Variations in Critical Success Factors over the Stages in the Project Lifecycle. In: Journal of Management
- Pinto, J. and Slevin, D. (1987). Critical Factors in Successful Project Implementation. In: IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management,
- Pinto, J.K, and D.P. Slevin. (1988). Critical Success Factors Across the Project Life Cycle. Project Management Journal, vol. XIX, no. 3 (Jun.),
- Pinto, Jeffrey K., and Dennis P. Slevin, (1988), Project Success: Definitions and Measurement Techniques, Project Management Journal, vol xix, No. 1, Project Management Institute, Upper Darby, PA,
- Rex Black, (2002) Managing the Testing Process: Practical Tools and Techniques for Managing Hardware and Software Testing
- Rockart, J. (1982). The Changing Role of the Information Systems Executive: A Critical Success Factors Perspective. In: Sloan Management Review, 23(1), 3-13.
- Steve Mankoff, (2006) Ten Critical Success Factors for CRM: Lessons Learned from Successful Implementations, An Oracle White Paper
- William E. Perry, Effective Methods for Software Testing
- William E. Perry, Randall W. Rice , Surviving the Top Ten Challenges of Software Testing: A People-Oriented Approach

## VIII. ANNEX

### User Questionnaire

#### Personal details

1. Please indicate your gender:

Female    Male

2. Please indicate your age category:

under 20    41 – 50    51 – 60  
 20 – 30    31 – 40    61 +

3. How experienced are you in using the internet?

- No experience  
 Basic Skills (internet browsing)  
 Intermediate Skills (word processing, data entry into spreadsheets, presentation applications)  
 Advanced Skills (router installation and administration, database management systems, computer hardware etc.)  
 Expert/Professional Skills (Software Developer, Systems Engineer, Network Designer etc.)

#### General

4. What is your interest in the political decision making process?

*Strong interest*

*No interest*

5	4	3	2	1
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. How much are you interested in smoking related policies?

*Strong interest*

*No interest*

5	4	3	2	1
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Please indicate the extent to which you found this site interesting

*High level of interest*

*Did not enjoy find it interesting*

5	4	3	2	1
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**7. What would make you return to this site?**

---



---

**8. If you could change one thing about the website, what would it be? Please describe**

---



---

**9. Considering what you have seen of the web site, what was the best feature?**

---



---

**10. Considering what you have seen of the web site what was the worst feature?**

---



---

**11. Did you find the website easy to use?**

Yes  No

If yes please describe which one(s) and why

---



---

**12. How much of the information on the site did you actually read?**

Please tick the numbered box.

None  Skim-read only  About half  Most of it  All of it

**13. Indicate by ticking the appropriate box the level to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.**

	Strongly	Disagree	Disagree Neither	Agree or	Disagree	Agree Strongly	Agree
I would recommend the website to friends, colleagues etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you think the portal provides you with a new perspective of the parliaments decision making process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The screen layout was easy to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It was easy to navigate through the website.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The number of steps required to get to the information I wanted was acceptable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Generally I understood the terminology used on the website.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt confident about the quality of the information provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Generally I found the information on the website easy to understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**14. If you have any other ideas, suggestions, and/or recommendations that you want us to know please provide us your feedback here:**

---



---

