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Meeting Agenda

The Joinup User Group Meeting (UGM) was held online through the MS TEAMS platform due to the Covid-19 situation. The meeting was organised by the Functional Team and the Project Managers of the Joinup Action (2016.20) with the following agenda:

- State of play & 2020 achievements;
- Understanding your needs – UX audit;
- The future of Joinup – brainstorming.

The section “The future of Joinup – brainstorming” introduced an interactive session in which the participants provided their feedback for the platform by accessing an online tool called MIRO. In MIRO, the Functional Team created a series of boards that addressed specific topics and showed the new potential design of some of the pages of the platform. Participants were asked to provide their feedback by interacting with these dashboards.

Meeting Summary

Context

From October 2017 and onwards, the re-designed Joinup platform has been receiving major enhancements in the areas of user-friendliness, mobile usability, stability etc. During 2020 and 2021, the Action will continue improving the platform, as well as engage further in increasing its user base.

Objectives of the meeting

Ludovic MAYOT, the Contractor’s Project Manager (CPM), opened the meeting by presenting the meeting’s objectives. Participants were asked to shortly present themselves in the chat area.

The objectives of the meeting were organised around the four following activities:

- Communicate and keep stakeholders up-to-date. The User Group meeting is an opportunity to communicate to stakeholders the status, usage of the Joinup platform, statistics, as well as present any important change in the vision, the usage or the functionalities of Joinup.
- Gather feedback, requests and understand the needs of stakeholders. The User Group meeting serves as a continuous source of feedback on improvements related to the system’s performance, policy and its users’ expectations and reactions. Moreover, by bringing stakeholders together helps create beneficial synergies across different ISA Actions.
- Provide support. The User Group meeting is also responsible for setting the tone for cooperation, and to support communication between the different teams involved in the project’s development. In this context, the User Group meeting represents impartially all stakeholders related to the project, allowing them to define or contribute to the general collaboration plan.
- Identify Requests for Change. The User Group meeting is an opportunity to identify Requests for Change regarding the functionalities of Joinup (change requests, bug fix requests, improvement requests, etc.). Requests are suggested/proposed and discussed during CAB meetings.

The presentation’s summary is provided below:

---

1 Miro is an online collaborative whiteboard platform that enables distributed teams to work effectively together, from brainstorming with digital sticky notes to planning and managing agile workflows: https://miro.com/app/
1) **State of play & 2020 achievements**

- The Project Team opened the session with a very brief reminder of the context and history of the platform and highlighted the latest efforts that lead to major achievements for the platform.
- What followed were the statistics on the trends in terms of amount of content, number of users and site visits.
- The presentation continued by highlighting the latest main achievements and a short overview of the new platform’s features and functionalities was given.

2) **Understanding your needs – UX Audit**

- The Project Team provided information on one of the key activities performed in the past months, which was the User Experience (UX) Audit.
- More specifically, the Project Team described the approach used to perform the UX audit, the type of analysis conducted and the pain points that were addressed. The Project Team also briefly outlined the outcomes and the UX recommendations.

3) **The future of Joinup – brainstorming**

- The Project Team briefly introduced the nature and the scope of the interactive session.
- The Project Team shared in the chat area the hyperlink to access the online tool MIRO.
- In the tool, the participants started interacting with 12 dashboards (see below), created in advance by the Project Team, with the aim to allow participants provide feedback on specific subjects (in the form or question/answer).
- All user feedback was collected from the boards and can be viewed more in details in Annex 1 – Collected User Feedback.
- The first board’s purpose was to allow users to get familiar with the MIRO tool. Seven boards addressed topics by posing questions. The lasts 4 boards showed a proposed new design of some of Joinup’s areas. The boards and the results of the brainstorming session are presented below.
BOARD 1 – World map for vacation (tool familiarisation)

This board was used by the Project Team to allow participants to get familiar with the MIRO tool, and understand how to properly interact with it. Thus, the results of this board should not be considered as part of the aim of this session.

BOARD 2 – First time visiting Joinup (the reasons)

This board’s aim was to collect the reasons users visited for the first time the Joinup platform. In addition to the reasons, the board also asked about and collected the emotional state of these first visits in order to delve into the Emotional Design (an approach to create user interfaces that deliver a positive user experience aspects). The results have been processed and categorised as follows:

What they were trying to do:
Look for specific information;
Promote content;
Browse the platform.

Why they were trying to do it:
- For potential cooperation and networking;
- Due to project requirements;
- To participate in events;
- To explore the platform.

Emotion they experienced during the process:
- Lost
- Happy
- Frustrated
- Normal
- Confused

Please check the Excel file in the Annex, which includes a complete transcript of the feedback given by the participants.

BOARD 3 – How did you discover Joinup?

This board motivated users to tell us how they found out about the Joinup platform. The results have been processed and categorised as shown below.

Discovered Joinup by:
- An acquaintance: (12/20) 60%
- While looking for a discussion topic: (12/20) 60%
- Myself: (8/20) 40%
- While looking for a solution: (8/20) 40%
BOARD 4 – Writing new content

This board asked users to tell us what motivates them to produce new content on Joinup. The results have been processed and categorised as shown below.

Motivated by:
- Keeping alive my solution/collection: (14/37) 38%
- Exchange with the community: (9/37) 24%
- Interest in a specific topic: (7/37) 19%
- Other reasons: (7/37) 19%

BOARD 5 – Feedback and user interactions
This board motivated users to tell us how they manage feedback and user interaction. The results have been processed and categorised as shown below.

- I don’t feel concerned: (6/16) 38%
- I am part of the exchange: (6/16) 38%
- I check every hour: (5/16) 31%
- The community is answering: (5/16) 31%
- All of the above: (5/16) 31%

**BOARD 6 – Collections and Solutions**

This board investigated the understanding and expectations of users around the two main entities of the platform, namely collections and solutions. The results have been processed and categorised as shown below.

**Users’ expectations for collections**
- To group together similar solutions;
- Be a broad community, and not a single team project;
- Bring together news, events and solutions around a topic;
- Subscriptions;
- Potential approach to changing community behaviour.

**Users’ expectations for solutions**
- Host releases;
- Source of news & information for the solution;
- Subscriptions;
- Notifications;
- A single team project, and not a broad community;
- Specific feature requests.

Please check the Excel file in the Annex, which includes a complete transcript of the feedback given by the participants.
BOARD 7 – Collection without solutions

This board attempted to gather the users’ opinion on collections that do not have solutions. The results have been processed and partially categorised as shown below.

What could their purpose be?
- Create a community;
- Create a space to exchange information, not necessarily for IT solutions;
- Observatory (e.g. NIFO).

How to make them more useful?
- Use collections as promotional channels;
- Collections should behave as a higher entity that embraces many related projects and not only a single one;
- Add a button that ensures navigation to sub-categories (i.e., like a tree-view mode).

Users’ evaluation
- Collections to be used as higher entities and promotional channels;
- The introduction of the EU Login authentication service decreased considerably the numbers of new members and their interaction;
- Better promotion of the discussion item;
- Better highlight of the categorisation of collections around themes.

Please check the Excel file in the Annex, which includes a complete transcript of the feedback given by the participants.
This board asked users to tell us where they think is the best place to animate their community. The results have been processed and categorised as shown below.

- **Other places**: (11/27) 40%
  - **Social media**: (5/27) 19%
  - **Webinar**: (2/27) 7%
  - **Newsletter**: (2/27) 7%
  - **Other**: (2/27) 7%
- **Within a solution**: (9/27) 33%
- **Within a collection**: (7/27) 27%
BOARD 9 – Joinup Home Page: pushed vs favourited content

This board motivated users to give their feedback on the proposed new design of the Joinup Homepage, which was created as a result of the UX audit performed in the past months by the Joinup Project Team.

Please check the Excel file in the Annex, which includes a complete transcript of the feedback given by the participants.

BOARD 10 – Solution page proposal

This board motivated users to give their feedback on the proposed new design of the Solution page, which was created as a result of the UX audit performed in the past months by the Joinup Project Team.

Please check the Excel file in the Annex, which includes a complete transcript of the feedback given by the participants.
BOARD 11 – Discussion page & interactions proposal

This board motivated users to give their feedback on the proposed new design of the Discussion page, which was created as a result of the UX audit performed in the past months by the Joinup Project Team.

Please check the Excel file in the Annex, which includes a complete transcript of the feedback given by the participants.

BOARD 12 – Searchability and Taxonomy

This board motivated users to give their feedback on the proposed new design of the Advance search and taxonomy, which was created as a result of the UX audit performed in the past months by the Joinup Project Team.

Please check the Excel file in the Annex, which includes a complete transcript of the feedback given by the participants.
This table highlights some of the key questions/comments and corresponding answers as posted in the chat area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Question/comment</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
<th>Answer/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In relation to EIF Toolbox it would be great to also see Open PM² reflected there, since it is a solution supported by ISA² and it can assist the national public administration to run effectively their interoperability-related projects too.</td>
<td>The Joinup Project Team will take this into account and further analyse it.</td>
<td>Subscriptions to collections already exist in Joinup platform. Subscription to solution is under development and will be in production in the next release. It is also planned a feature for owners, to contact members and unauthorized users. In any case you can contact me at <a href="mailto:Emmanoul.CHRISTAKIS@trasys.gr">Emmanoul.CHRISTAKIS@trasys.gr</a> in order to elaborate more on the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Something that came up recently; Someone using our Software wasted a lot of time on a bug that we already solved. Because he didn't know about our newest release. As a workaround, I now added him as a member and asked him to setup notifications for our collection. I was informed that there is an RSS feed for that. However, in this scenario, it would be a lot more appealing to offer a mailing list to inform users about new releases. Additionally I suppose most of our users don't have a JoinUp account</td>
<td>The Joinup Project Team will take this into account and further analyse it.</td>
<td>The Joinup Project Team will take this into account and further analyse it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One small thing about interface revamping: If you look at the GOOGLE search engine interface, now and 20 years ago, it is the same, or more exactly it LOOKS the same: changes (a lot) are in the background. And this is a success. So when “revamping” make all necessary improvements, but resist a little bit to creative designer’s trend to completely change the look, especially top-level front pages.</td>
<td>The Joinup Project Team will take this into account and further analyse it.</td>
<td>The Joinup Project Team will take this into account and further analyse it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feature request: Certain solutions need to host extended documentation that cannot be captured with custom pages. We (Test Bed) created a static HTML documentation site that is hosted elsewhere (we link to it from Joinup). I know of other solutions that are doing something similar with GitHub.io websites. Is there a way for Joinup to allow solution/collection owners to publish static doc sites under Joinup? (e.g. upload a set of resources to expose statically).</td>
<td>We'll investigate this interesting request. There are possibilities i.e., integrating wiki-style functionality for such documentation. We'll keep a note of this and explore as much as possible.</td>
<td>We'll investigate this interesting request. There are possibilities i.e., integrating wiki-style functionality for such documentation. We'll keep a note of this and explore as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There's another feature I wanted to bring up linked to publishing semantic specs via Joinup. We can import e.g. an RDF vocabulary as a data graph. However accessing this as e.g. RDF/XML or Turtle is done via requests with different paths/URIs (&quot;I'm thinking of the &quot;View metadata feature&quot;). Joinup should ideally support content negotiation, meaning that we have a single URI and what you get when accessing it (HTML, Turtle, RDF/XML) depends on your HTTP request (Accept header). This might sound very technical but is important if we want to have a published PURI for a vocabulary that can be dereferenced as needed.</td>
<td>We support this for skos vocabularies already. Since all skos vocabularies use the same ontology, we can provide a reasonable HTML representation. For other ontologies, it would be more a sort of listing of the predicate-object pairs on the HTML version... e.g. <a href="http://data.europa.eu/dr8/InteroperabilitySkill">http://data.europa.eu/dr8/InteroperabilitySkill</a> has content negotiation</td>
<td>We support this for skos vocabularies already. Since all skos vocabularies use the same ontology, we can provide a reasonable HTML representation. For other ontologies, it would be more a sort of listing of the predicate-object pairs on the HTML version... e.g. <a href="http://data.europa.eu/dr8/InteroperabilitySkill">http://data.europa.eu/dr8/InteroperabilitySkill</a> has content negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Another change request I'd like to report is the ability to personalise the landing page. At the moment, the landing page is defined per default on the Overview page if I'm not mistaken. It could be interesting to be able to change and automatically redirect to About page for example</td>
<td>The Joinup Project Team will take this into account and further analyse it.</td>
<td>The Joinup Project Team will take this into account and further analyse it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table summarises the actions logged during the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Id</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Owner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Distribution of the minutes to participants</td>
<td>03/12/20</td>
<td>Joinup Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Publication of the Roadmap</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Joinup Project Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex

[SC417_UGM_Collect user feedback.pdf]