**Workshop Report:**
**Third workshop on new**
**EU eGovernment Action Plan 2016 - 2020**

**Brussels, 15 December 2015**

# Table of Contents

# Preface

Following the success of the last two workshops on the EU eGovernment Action Plan, DG Connect decided to organise a third workshop, held at the Van Maerlant Building in Brussels on 15 December 2015.

One of the main purposes of this meeting was to present and test the eGovernment stakeholder engagement platform. While the previous workshop showed the concept of Futurium in general, the idea behind this workshop was to present what eGovernment4EU (on Futurium) involves in reality and hear the suggestions of stakeholders. It  was a hands-on activity, offering participants the opportunity to explore the platform's functionalities and provide feedback.

# Introduction

*Mechthild ROHEN, Head of Unit Connect H3, Public Services*

This is the third workshop in a series of several workshops organized over the past few months in preparation of the new dynamic eGovernment Action Plan 2016-2020. They demonstrate the key commitment to engage with citizens, businesses, NGOs and public administrations (all our stakeholders) and to listen to them. This workshop in particular is dedicated to stakeholder's engagement. Setting the context for the workshop, it was noted that more than a decade of EU eGovernment initiatives and cooperation with Member States had resulted in benefits for citizens and businesses. These include increased transparency and greater participation of citizens in political life. The workshop today relates to this participation focus. The Vision for Public Services paper, issued by the Public Services Unit in DG CONNECT, recognizes that increasing information and knowledge exchange as well as enhanced connectivity, openness and transparency are providing new opportunities for public administrations to become more efficient and effective, while reducing costs and administrative burden. The steady integration of technology into the everyday lives of citizens, businesses and governments also offers opportunities for more collaborative participatory relationships, allowing the relevant shareholders to shape political priorities, to collaborate in the design of public services and to participate in their delivery, and to provide more integrated solutions to complex challenges. This open government approach can be a step change towards the transformation of government. We are not alone in advocating this vision. If you look at what the OECD is doing, in their publication Together for Better Public Services you see that they analyse the partnerships that governments form with civil society to innovate and to deliver improved public services. Their recommendation on digital government strategies for 2014 put forward concrete suggestions to make this a reality, first by ensuring the transparency, openness and inclusiveness of government processes, and by engaging and encouraging the participation of public, private and civil society stakeholders in policy-making and public service design and delivery. We are working towards the same vision in our new eGovernment Action Plan for 2016-2020.

At the beginning of this month we had an eGovernment conference organized by the Luxembourg presidency. EU Vice President Andrus Ansip, in his speech at the conference, laid out a set of principles that guide our work, indicating that he would want the public sector to be digital by default, open by default, and cross-border by default. He also emphasized that we should open our doors and minds to citizen and community involvement. It is in this spirit that we have been developing the new eGovernment Action Plan for 2016-2020. As you know, the Commission's Digital Single Market strategy already includes objectives for the eGovernment area and for the eGovernment Action Plan. It identifies that the aim should be to implement initiatives to modernize public administration, achieve cross-border interoperability and facilitate easy interaction for citizens.

Our aim for the remainder of this period of the new Action Plan is not only to prepare it as a static action plan, but also to enable citizens and stakeholders to suggest actions. The Commission would like to lead by example by engaging citizens and civil society in the elaboration of the Action Plan itself. This

workshop is a key step in collaboratively deciding how these actions could be formulated, co-created and submitted using the stakeholder engagement platform eGovernment4EU, dedicated to the eGovernment Action Plan.

As regards the current stage of preparation of the new eGovernment Action Plan - we have been working with the Member States' representatives in the in the eGovernment high-level expert group and with the Commission services on the preparation. We have published a roadmap, which outlines the main problems we have taken as a starting point. The roadmap has been published online and is open for comments. We have also launched a public consultation which is open until January 22 - this is addressed to citizens, businesses and civil servants in public administrations.

The eGovernment conference in Luxembourg covered a lot of interesting topics related to relevant aspects of the new Action Plan, such as the once-only principle, eIDAS implementation, open data, citizen engagement and cross-border services.

There have also already been a couple of workshops in preparation of the Action Plan, one in July where we collected input to the policy-framing of the Action Plan and a second in November, as part of which there was a good discussion with stakeholders regarding their experience of online public engagement.

This third workshop in the series goes a step further. It will try to simulate the way ideas for action can be co-created by stakeholders, how these can be submitted through a dedicated stakeholder platform(and eventually go through a selection process for being implemented by Member States and/or the Commission). The active participation and feedback from the workshop's participants will be key to fine-tuning the process. Finally, a multi-stakeholder event is planned for early next year, and will likely take place in February, to present the results of the public consultation.

# Co-creation of actions

*Andrea Halmos, DG CNECT H3, Public Services*

## Introduction

The vision that has been laid out in the Vision for Public Services paper has been helping us to move our eGovernment initiative at European level to ensure user-friendly digital services. We believe that public services should be delivered digitally, but we also need to ensure that they reach everyone. We see a huge possibility for reducing administrative burden by delivering services digitally. We need to ensure that public administrations are connected across borders and that cross-border services are delivered seamlessly, so that business and citizens can move between countries and access the same quality of services wherever they are. This relies on the development of seamless cross-border technologies and services and the reuse of existing successful technologies.

We see a great potential for opening up public administrations - opening government data, services and processes to engage third-parties to create better or new services and help improve policies. We also see a great advantage in opening up the decision-making process so that people can take part in shaping political and policy decisions. For this to happen there will have to be a change in government. This is not only a technological change, but also a cultural change. We have been discussing this with public administrations at all levels and we have been able to support this in a number of ways - particularly through Horizon 2020 project funding.

The Digital Single Market strategy foresees that there will be an eGovernment Action Plan for 2016-2020 as the current eGovernment Action Plan comes to an end at the end of 2015. It also recognizes all the good work that has been done by the Member States, in collaboration with the Commission, but at the same time it recognizes that there is a need to further modernise public administrations, achieve cross-border interoperability and facilitate easy interaction with citizens. We are now planning to set up a policy framework along these lines, grouping initiatives around these policy priorities. We continue supporting Member States in modernising public administrations with ICT - digitising and making them more effective. We need to continue closing the gap in the digital single market, so that citizens and businesses can benefit from mobility - and this requires interoperability and cooperation between public administrations. As ICT facilitates interaction, we also need to make sure that we reap the benefits of this by allowing stakeholders to participate in service identification, creation, design and delivery. In order to make this happen, we need to make sure that key enablers are in place.

This is the overarching policy framework for the forthcoming Action Plan, and there are a number of actions already identified in the Digital Single Market strategy. Some more actions may be identified at Commission level. However, we see an opportunity for stakeholders to be engaged in identifying additional actions to be included in the coming years. So we would like to lead by example, by applying the principles of innovative, open and collaborative government and by enabling the co-creation of

strategic initiatives. We would also like to use the data provided to help us achieve more evidence-informed policy making. To do this we are setting up a digital engagement platform to facilitate stakeholder involvement in setting the policy framework, within which we would like to understand what the main issues are for stakeholders and what actions or solutions they propose to address these issues. So, we will be crowdsourcing ideas for action and allowing stakeholders to collaboratively propose concrete actions. The aim is to engage as many stakeholders as we can, to ensure that the actions are impactful and can be implemented as part of the EU eGovernment Action Plan. Stakeholders will have the opportunity to justify why they feel the proposed action is important and based on this the Member States along with the Commission, will select the actions to be implemented. It will be possible to monitor and evaluate the implementation of actions and to provide feedback, making it possible to iteratively improve the actions. There is still a lot of scope for input from stakeholders to define what this process will be and to make sure that it is user-friendly - and this is the core aim of the current workshop.

The aim of the morning session of the workshop was to collect input from stakeholders on the main issues they encounter with public administrations as citizens or as businesses, then to discuss in small groups what solutions or actions could be implemented to deal with these issues. Finally, once issues and solutions had been identified in the morning session, the afternoon session was given over to uploading these ideas and solutions onto the platform, with the aim of identifying how the platform functionalities might be improved, before it is launched in Q2 2016.

# Identifying the issues (collective mind map)

*Serge Novaretti, DG CNECT H3, Public Services*

The workshop participants were asked to identify what they feel are the main issues when dealing with public administrations. The participants wrote their thoughts on post-it notes which they assigned to three policy areas:

- Modernising public administration;
- Cross-border digital public services;
- Participation and co-creation; and
- Digital enablers.

There was also an empty policy block for suggestions that do not fall within the four main categories.

Some of the issues raised in the four areas were as follows:

| Modernising public administration | Cross-border digital public services | Participation and co-creation | Digital enablers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Open collaborative service design | No European eID for cross-border services | Commission commits to being at least as advanced as the most advanced Member State for eParticipation and open data | Mobile / eID / cloud / social media / IoT |
| Interaction between different public services (once only) | Access to public information / data for citizens and business | Focus on tools to connect good eParticipation initiatives in Member States | Single central service network |
| If a citizen requests a document from a regional administration, they need to go in person to collect it | Single market enablers for businesses and citizens | Open service provision workflows to citizens for suggestions and improvements | European citizen cloud for public services |
| Simplify before digitising | Smart mobility | Use participatory method to develop participation tools | Make it possible to register start-up / freelance activity online |
| Need to submit same documents again and again to different administrations | How to incentivise national governments to align digital platforms | Encourage people to participate by making it fun and allowing them to see results | Lack of mobile functionalities for eID and eGov services |
| Need to reach low-demographic areas | Standardise online registration procedures for citizens relocating to new countries / municipalities | Co-creation and co-design of services/ smart cities, smart citizens / policy shaping and policy stakeholders / urban planning / participatory budgets | A real single portal for government services (other than Google) |
| Train non-digital citizens and government workers to use new eGov technologies | One administrative system / platform, especially for cross-border actions | Participation should avoid repeated events on the same theme and should encourage create environments | Building trust (trust centre, seal of approval, etc.) |
| Business process re-engineering of public services | There is currently no way to submit employment history documents online | Better promote existing participatory solutions to citizens | Different approach of citizens to digital opportunities |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Make available online in a more user-friendly format all the info needed to meet obligations | Make it easier to fulfil legal and fiscal obligations online | Lack of best interchanging best practices | Identifying strategic factors for success of eGov activities |
| Lack of knowledge about which digital public services exist, or which administrations provide them | Public services for citizens available in English in each MS to enhance mobility | eParticipation through the digital ECI framework | Trust and security versus convenience |
| Open collaborative service design | Not possible to access tax system online in home country when living abroad | More transparency in ICT projects implemented by public administrations | Why are these building blocks not implemented / used. Lack of specifications? |
| Enable the easy registration of start-ups and freelancers (once only principle) | Create unified core of processes | No eVoting area | |
| Hybrid solutions needed for digital services in the transformation phase | Connectivity between different eID tools is missing | Co-create the technical implementing regulation of the ECI | |
| Define what you mean by modernising | Info exchange between document systems | Imitate the crowdsourcing experience at EU level. | |
| Political commitment to break with legacy and truly modernise structures / processes / systems | | How to motivate people to participate constructively | |
| Connect base registries within each country and decrease the administrative burden | | Increase participation rates of expats in local elections | |
| | | More user-friendly interfaces on citizen eParticipation platforms | |

This was then followed by group discussions of the actions that could be taken to tackle the issues that were identified by the participants, with feedback being provided by each of the groups.

# From problem definition to concrete solutions

Before the exercise began, some information was provided as to the rationale behind it. In the current eGovernment Action Plan (2010-2015) there are four policy priorities, each of which includes concrete actions for implementation that were put in place at the very beginning of the Action Plan. In total, there are 40 actions that were addressed to the Member States and/or the Commission for implementation. As time moved on, some actions became less relevant than they were at the beginning of the Action Plan; indicating that there may be a need for a more flexible, dynamic action plan to keep track of the fast changing environment. As in the past, the new Action Plan will be based on a policy framework, built around four priority policy areas. However, it will be dynamically evolving; allowing stakeholders to continuously propose ideas for action and adapting the actions through iterations should it become necessary. The actions need to be impactful, as the nature of those actions identified in the Digital Single Market Strategy implies: the interconnection of business registers across Europe, ensuring that information about public services is provided in a user-friendly manner through a single digital gateway, piloting the possibility of applying the once-only principle at European level, and accelerating Member States' transition towards full eProcurement and interoperable eSignatures. What we are now trying to do is to co-create similarly impactful additional actions with the participation of stakeholders, and by doing so we will co-create the process design and the functionalities of the platform.

# Discussion

The feedback from the breakout sessions on what ideas or actions are required to tackle the issues raised was as follows:

**Modernising public administration**
Issues raised were grouped according to their impact. When prioritising issues based on their impact two criteria were used: the level of impact perceived by citizens and business; and the costs for public administrations. When talking about the perceived impact, two main ideas emerged: avoiding the need for physical presence, when chosen, and the once-only principle. But we also need to keep in mind the digital divide. Not everyone will want to receive services digitally, and citizens should receive access to services in the format they require.

Regarding the implementation of these measures, an emphasis was made on the technology and infrastructure required - open, collaborative service design and mobile units, which are public administration units that go to those citizens that still want offline services. The principle of digital by default, and training in eSkills - these are more enablers, but these issues were also tagged as being important by the group.

In addition to implementation, the group felt that dissemination of best practices was important. Also important is changing mind-sets on both sides - on the side of citizens and businesses, but also on the

side of public administrations - the terms 'breaking the legacy' and 'changing the culture' were often mentioned in the group. There is a need for flexibility in the interpreting of roles - different people in public administrations should have a more multi-tasking role. The group discussed a possible implementation model, beginning with an idea for implementation, followed by the provision of the skills needed to implement it, in addition to the incentive to use these skills.

It is also important to define what modernising means: two models were raised. First, the static model - this involves breaking the silos, to change processes and structures towards a more horizontal approach, with cloud infrastructure, open data and open platforms, interoperable solutions and modular reusable platforms. The need to align the budget with the vision was also mentioned. In the dynamic model, the focus was put on 'bipolar' relations between citizens and stakeholders and the public administration on the other side. The ideas of hybrid construction and co-creation were also discussed, as was the idea of engaging citizens to provide services together with public administrations. A picture was drawn of the ideal public administration, and the keywords here were simplification (the once-only principle), administration should be intuitive (it should be easy for citizens to find the services they need). Finally, trust and security are big challenges that need to be tackled.

**Digital cross-border public services**
The focus here was digital services, and it was important to clarify this at the start so that there are no practical issues concerning offline services. The first issue raised was multilingualism. Citizens from country A living in country B may not speak the local language, and general administrations work in the local language and do not offer additional language choices. It was felt that the principle of subsidiarity should apply here, with the three main European languages offered as an alternative to the local language.

Another issue raised was administrative services, such as taxation, SMEs, organising of legal issues. More interoperability and standardisation is required. Accessibility is also an issue - where to go to access services, there should be a single point of contact. Policy issues were also discussed, concerning cross-border interoperability – health, justice, security and so on. The main enablers of cross-border interoperability should be identified. The implementation aspect was also raised, as many of these issues were previously resolved, but now the main challenge is the implementation of cross-border by default. Also linked to implementation, one challenge that was identified was how to deal with cross border trust issues. The possibility of a new tool along the lines of Trip Advisor was also suggested. This would make it possible to benchmark digital cross-border services for citizens and business.

The group also discussed citizenship services, for example participation in the civic life of new city or place of residence, as well as continuing to participate in the civic life of the home country. The final point raised was the organisation of enablers, for example the eID, and it was suggested that it might be useful focus on benchmarking for Member States.

**Participation and co-creation**

When working through the post-it notes, it was noted that there were three main topics. The first was the need to gather and disseminate best practices. Here the problem is that we don't know what the best practices and solutions are, and so we are missing opportunities to take advantage of them. Some solutions to this would be to benchmark best practices at all levels (EU, national and local), promote dissemination, take advantage of existing frameworks, and to involve non-government and other organisations in this process.

The second topic raised was the need to bring stronger eParticipation processes at EU, national and local levels. The existing provision of the Europe Citizens' Initiative was discussed and it was felt that this does not work properly. It was found that the eID dimension is not working as it should and there is no citizen engagement in co-creating this tool. So, it was suggested to apply co-creation mechanisms for the redesign of this platform to make it more effective.

Another issue discussed was the low transparency and lack of access to information on the policy-making process. Some suggestions made included having leadership and political commitment to form an open data forum to discuss and form rules and guidelines. We need to bring regulations such as the right to information, which will be enacted with clear accountability and timeframes to respond to the public. The process of responding to requests should be transparent and it should be possible to track the information flow. Another suggestion was to provide standardisation and harmonisation of the PSI provisions - which should be presented in a user-friendly manner for all stakeholders.

Another problem is that there is no participatory culture and stakeholders have no incentives to participate in policy-making. A solution would be to introduce motivation mechanisms and platforms at EU and local level. Another idea is to involve participation processes in the procurement domain. It was also felt to be important to have feedback and accountability in policy-making. Another issue is that we do not adequately reuse successful processes and infrastructures in the domain of participation and co-creation. One suggestion was to increase use of existing processes and structures that have proved their effectiveness, such as the Wikipedia process, or to initiate crowd sourcing models.

The above mainly pertained to eParticipation platforms and solutions. Some other suggestions were made about moving participatory processes forward in other domains, like eVoting. It was suggested to raise awareness and create incentives for systems like this. Another suggestion was to put in place co-creation mechanisms for public services and to use open processes to evaluate and improve these services.

**Digital enablers**

The first cluster of needs that were identified included the fact that people do not have a single access point to government – a single digital gateway is required (the experience of the UK was discussed). It was also noted that there is a lot of information available on digital public services, it might be important to

create a central hub for this information, allowing people to find these services more easily. It was also stressed that information about public services should be available as open data, using open standards.

Another group of needs included dealing with the digital divide and digital inclusion. Administrations sometimes do not have the digital skills required to provide the right digital services. They do not have the skills to set up co-creation of digital services, so they need to be educated. Civil servants, citizens and businesses alike need to be educated regarding the use of digital public services. There is also a need to develop skills around co-creation and service design.

The third area of action starts from the problem that public administrations deal with their own business and are unaware of the building blocks and the digital enablers and the best practices that are available from other administrations, even in the same country. There should be an action to promote common solutions. These common solutions should be based on open software and open services. This action should also create transparency about the use of these solutions.

Another idea was to promote open by default when building digital enablers. More emphasis is needed both at the EU level and at national level on open source and standards. It is also very important to have common legal frameworks. It is not possible to build a thousand digital enablers, so it is important to prioritise. Promotion of digital enablers should not be conducted in English only, but in all languages of the EU.

**Overview**

The discussion showed that some the principles suggested around digital services and for the Action Plan have been endorsed by stakeholders. There are many overlapping issues and interlinkages and many existing ideas and existing solutions to some of the issues that were raised, and these could be explored more. In terms of the process, it seems to be effective to have groups identify issues, with people suggesting solutions and contributing to turn these suggestions into concrete actions.

# Co-creation of the online platform

*Anders Gjoen, DG CNECT H3, Public Services*

## Introduction

The purpose of the afternoon session was not so much to co-create ideas and content, but to co-create the platform itself. The idea behind the platform is to share issues, propose solutions and allow people to co-create ideas online. The groups from the morning session provided issues on digital public services and suggested solutions. The aim of the afternoon session was to ask the present stakeholders about how this can best be expressed on the platform, and what technology or system should be made available for this purpose.

## Presentation of platform

*Luca Arnaudo, DG CNECT R3*

This section of the workshop consisted of a presentation of the Futurium website, which allows various platforms for engagement. There are currently three different engagement activities ongoing on the site, including Digital4EU, which speaks about what Europe could gain from improved digital single market. Another - Digital4Science - is specific to research in science, and there is one that is being used by DG REGIO for structural funds. On the home page there is a feed of ideas, comments and events provided by users. This tool implements a policy 3.0 approach that relies on evidence-based participatory policy-making; this means that every idea/issue can be linked to an evidence and/or a solution. Every engagement activity has a different model – a different landing page with topics.

The aim of this section of the workshop was to try and use this platform to upload the ideas and contributions made in the morning session. To facilitate this, a playground environment - eGovernment4EU - was set up with some engagement activities already prepared to go live. Here problems could be linked to a discussion, and discussions could be supported by evidence, such as libraries, etc.

The real purpose is to give a structure to the engagement process. This is why there is an evidence layer that can be adapted for each engagement activity, without becoming incompatible with other engagement spaces that are present on the same tool. This system is still rough around the edges, so the idea of the workshop was to get ideas about how to fine-tune the platform. After the workshop, the content of the test environment will be exported, so that this can be reintroduced in the live platform in a few months when relevant. As regards the platform going live - there will be a communication from the Commission in May-June next year, after which the platform will be online and will remain in place for the entire period of the Action Plan – to 2020.

The workshop participants were then invited to go online and input the contributions co-created during the morning session, and then share any feedback that they might have about the types of functionalities that

they would like to see.

A question was asked from the floor about what the practical results of the contributions would be. In response, it was reiterated that the aim is to co-create the eGovernment Action Plan. The purpose is to bring stakeholders together to identify the main issues that they encounter when dealing with their own government or during cross-border interactions. If someone has an issue, it will help public administrations to identify that a problem exists and allow stakeholders to jointly make suggestions about how it can be resolved, and provide evidence to show that the suggested solution will have an impact. These solutions will then be put to the Member States and a decision will be reached on which actions will be implemented. This will be communicated on the platform, where it will also be possible to monitor its implementation. Ideas not implemented will remain on the platform and contributors can add more evidence, for example, which may result in them being implemented in the future.

## Co-creation and discussion

The feedback received from the groups was as follows:

**Group 1**

1. Nobody was happy with the labelling of the four categories - it was unclear how users should select a category. In addition, the wording 'my problem' is not very positive - this could be changed to my proposal, my idea, my suggestion. The group felt that it would be better to start by filling in a form directly, without selecting one of four categories. If categorisation is necessary, then this should be done in the form, as a drop down list
2. The testers didn't like the editing / formatting options – a better editor would be helpful.
3. It was agreed that users should not be required to provide tags, but the system should be able to harvest keywords / tags, instead of asking the user to give these.
4. Warnings / message were received when imputing text. These were aimed at programmers, not at policy-makers.
5. There is a need for users to know that the actions they input are part of a larger process. It is important that they should know that they are contributing for a reason. In addition, they should be able to track what has happened to their proposal once it has been submitted. So, there should be an audit trail to track how any proposal provided has been used.
6. The group suggested some fields to be used in the form:
   - What is your proposal about (50 words);
   - Describe your proposal and the offered recommendations (500 words);
   - What are the issues you are trying to address (500 words);
   - Who would benefit from your idea (e.g. EU, national, local level);
   - Provide any examples or references relevant to the proposal (with upload function, for text and documents – optional);
   - Would you be interested in joining a forum or a working group?

- Contact info (optional).


**Group 2**

1. When submitting the problem, there were some comprehension issues, there was confusion about what kind of problems could be submitted, and how they are classified. It was felt to be bit negative to speak about 'my problems'. That said, the group recognised that the platform needs to be issue-driven - and suggested 'my issue' as an alternative.
2. As regards comprehensibility, there was confusion about the difference between a problem and a discussion or idea on the platform. The wording is not consistent at this point in time.
3. In terms of usability, the button to link ideas with evidence and events didn't work well – it is not immediately understandable how to do this. The ability to link ideas to problems is missing.
4. It was also felt that an overview of the process is missing – allowing users to know what will happen next. People would like to have a status overview on their problem, and also on the actions that are being co-created on the platform. The ability to form a working group to cooperate on an action is also missing.
5. Voting could be more differentiated. There was a question about what voting could be used for. Prioritization was the main suggestion: if some issues get many votes and are rated highly, then these could be prioritised. If hundreds of people submit problems, there is a need for a way to cluster them around common themes. This is something that the platform could support automatically or manually.
6. It was also felt that it is very important to provide early feedback on the relevance of problems. This will avoid entire discussions around problems that are outside the scope of the platform or the Action Plan itself.
7. From a usability point of view, it is not very easy to follow the discussions very easily. It is not evident from the list how many comments there are.


**Group 3**

1. The use of the word 'problem' was perceived to be negative.
2. On a more practical level, the fact that the 'add' button is to the right, when 'add text' appears one the left (without being able to click on 'add text') is confusing.
3. On the home page there is no rating of the issues that received the highest number of comments – allowing users to see the most relevant ones.
4. It is not possible to identify the most active users. When you enter a user's profile, you should be able to see what comments and issues they created, and so on.
5. It is a bit confusing that it is not possible to see only issues, only events or only ideas – everything is all merged together. The semantics are not consistent.If a user wants to see all the problems submitted by all the users, it is not intuitive to go to 'my problem with' because you expect that this will your problems, not other users' problems.
6. It is unnecessary to receive notification that you have commented yourself.
7. It would be helpful to be able to reply to an email without going to the website, to publish from the

email into the platform.

8. It is not necessary to have to put in a title for the replies in the comments, this is time consuming.
9. Several issues were identified regarding the events tab. The order of events does not respect 24 hour chronology, later event are shown first if they are entered earlier.
10. We don't think that the platform should allow you to change tabs without informing you that you are editing – an alert should be put in place.
11. The search bar does not work well.

**Group 4**

1. It was felt that Futurium is a good platform – but not yet.
2. This group had similar issues with 'my problem' and with the tags. It is a bit confusing if you have to come up with your own tags.
3. There was also an issue with the discussion button. Here the group suggested a dashboard, where you can configure your personal notification settings.
4. The structure of the comments was felt to be a bit confusing. Options should be included for the title field in the comments, because if you start with a phrase, this is captured – it would be better to have a mandatory title.
5. There were issues with the search – it should be possible to use keywords rather than tags.
6. There should be more social media options – for example the ability to share comments, discussions, issues or documents.
7. Gamification could be used to encourage engagement – for example the principle of kudos – to encourage people to be more active.
8. Also there is no distinction between the different comments – whether they are an idea, just a comment, a best practice, etc. The discussions could be structured better.
9. A short 'work through video' could be provided to promote the platform.
10. Posting a comment on the platform should be as simple as posting a comment on Facebook.
11. It could be interesting to know what the main categories of issues to be addressed are.
12. It would also be good to have your country's flag next to your name this could also be used for statistics and language options. If tags are used, a cloud tag could be integrated.
13. At the beginning you should have to identify yourself as a citizen, a civil servant, etc.
14. It should also be possible to conduct mini-polling and surveys – which would allow you to mine statistics.

## Summary

A number of common points emerged from the feedback, particularly regarding the use of the word 'problem' which was perceived to be negative. Other common issues concerned tags, the search function and the possibility to track the progress of a suggested action. More than one group identified inconsistencies with the terminology used.

The feedback will be processed and prioritised, after which a silent launch will be organised, without making it visible on Google. Stakeholders will then be able to see that their contributions at the workshop

have been properly understood and provide further feedback. As soon as it is agreed that the platform is ready for general launch, this silent launch will be made public. The participants were also asked to volunteer to test the platform further for a few months from February and could be done remotely.

# Closing remarks

*DG CNECT H3 Public Services*

In conclusion, it was noted that the workshop had helped generate a clearer understanding of how the process should progress and how the platform could become more user friendly and a truly useful tool. It will also help in the discussions around what concrete actions will be in the Action Plan throughout 2016-2020. The open consultation on the Action Plan is open until 22 January. Once it is finished and the results have been analysed, a larger multi-stakeholder event will be organised to reflect on these findings. The date of this event has yet to be set, but it will take place in the first quarter of 2016.

# Annex I: Agenda

## Workshop towards a new dynamic eGovernment Action Plan

*Date: Tuesday, 15 December 2015*

*Location: Van Maerlant Building, room VML02*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 09:45- 10:00 | Welcome/Registration | |
| 10:00- 10:15 | Opening | Mechthild ROHEN, Head of Unit Connect H3,  Public Services |
| 10:15- 11:30 | Co-creation of actions | |
| 10:15- 10:30 | Introduction | Andrea Halmos & Serge Novaretti, DG CNECT H3, Public Services |
| **10:30- 11:00** | Identifying the issues(collective mind map) | All participants |
| **11:00- 11:15** | Coffee break | |
| **11:15 – 12:45** | From problem definition to concrete solutions | All participants, group discussion |
| **12:45- 13:45** | *Lunch* | |
| **13:45- 15:45** | Co-creation of the online platform | |
| | Introduction | Anders Gjoen, DG CNECT H3, Public Services |
| | Presentation of platform | Luca Arnaudo, DG CNECT R3 |
| | Co-creation and discussion (hands-on session) | All participants |
| | Summary | DG CNECT H3 |
| **15:45- 16:00** | **Closing remarks** | DG CNECT H3, Public Services |