



Social Evaluation of “i-COIN” products and decisions of INTERREG IIB project “Interregional Communication and Information Network” (i-COIN)

Dr. Ausrine Armaitiene

Social evaluation of i-COIN products consist from 2 phases of the process. First phase was devoted to the internal evaluation of project partners of their project results and second one was devoted to the external evaluation of project partners’ products. i-COIN project partners completed questionnaire to gain the purpose of internal evaluation. The questionnaire was prepared by EUCC, as responsible partner for i-COIN WP5. For external evaluation of project partners’ products was chosen method of semi structured interviews and was conducted by partners. General questions were given by EUCC.

Main evaluated project products were e-services and e-services platforms of municipalities. In evaluation participated I-COIN partner organizations: COI POLAND, Svenljunga Sweden, ProArbeit / EU- Office Landkreis Osterholz, Municipality of Rehna Germany, Kymenlaakso Polytechnic, University of Applied Sciences, North Denmark EU-Office

i-COIN project partners’ internal evaluation of i-COIN project results

Method. For internal evaluation of i-COIN project partners’ activities within the project and of their project results was composed questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted from 14 questions. 12 questions were free form questions, one question was proposed with Likert scale and one question was composed with range scale of 5 grades.

Questionnaire was completed by all i-COIN partners.

Main results.

The list of partners’ project results. The main achievement of the project by project partners was stated as “awareness” of different target groups of the project. Four partners agreed, that main projects results are related with awareness building of municipality’ employees and heads and information spread about result, while some partners stated, that investigations within the project are aspired and achieved project’ results.

Self evaluation of project results achieved by i-COIN partners (until July, 2007). Partners evaluated each project result, which was listed in the first question. Major part of partners tried to use unbiased sources and was seeking for objective evaluation of their products: local government authorities, schools representatives, citizens, staff were mentioned. Descriptive evaluation of all results took place. Some partnes indicated, that achievement of the results helped them „ to have better ideas now of what is needed to better communication between citizens and local authorities on the eGov sector and in general“, to understand „, that a lot of questions are not possible to be solved in this project“, „led to a sustainable result to foster customer oriented eServices“. All results were evaluated positively: good or very good.

Listing and evaluation of products created in i-COIN (until July 2007). Within the project were created many products, that vary from eGovernment concept and platform utilization prototype to press releases. All partners mentioned local pilot platform, as product already created. The list of products include: local pilot platform, eGovernment concept; Guideline for barriere free Internet, i-COIN platform utilization prototype, User panel report, Questionnaire regarding pilot process description, Questionnaire juxtaposition, Pilot requirements juxtaposition, terminals-communication links, GIS implementation press releases, mercantiles, newsletters, brochures, project website, updated official homepage.



Evaluation of the products. Evaluation of the products was proposed as procedure with marking products in 5 grades scale, where 1 means very badly, 2- badly, 3 – moderately, 4 – good, 5 – very good. Despite the list of the project results was different partners' evaluation of the results were analogous. Almost all partners their products judged as “good”. Two products were evaluated as “very good”: i-COIN platform utilization prototype and local pilot platform.

Strengths and weaknesses of the products. Partners mentioned 17 strengths and 15 weaknesses. Strengths were related mainly with usefulness of products and weaknesses more expressed the presumed future problems.

According to partners' opinion **strengths** of the products were:

- cost effective solution
- easy to use
- flexible product
- any functionalities can be added or altered regarding requirements.
- chance to gather all information about requirements and demands
- possibility to compare and contrast answers
- creation of prototype and entering next phase of software development
- citizens can use terminals at the countryside
- Easy marketing of the project
- Easy to reach the “it-citizens” through the web
- Involvement of relevant parts of municipality staff and consumer stakeholders in the development process
- Good overview about all relevant aspects to create userfriendly web sites
- pilot platform: is very flexible to be advanced and
- to be used for different applications
- pilot application: we think , it could be a good idea
- Usefull service for citizens and it helps municipality workers at their jobs
- An extremely good e-Service for the target group

Weaknesses:

- integration of i-COIN product might be difficult due to low interoperability level of legacy systems.
- Some works must be done in order to improve its usability and reliability
- some information were missing
- Missing possibility to place terminals outside
- follow up from press is hard to get
- Complicated contacts with those who doesn't want to use IT as a tool
- Difficulties in getting the right engagement from a citizen perspective
- Cost and time consuming_implementation process which can not be achieved within I-Coin project
- Due to time consuming planning processes between municipality and county to set up a common new regional portal solution the findings will not be used during the remaining runtime of the I-Coin project
- durability is problematic
- pilot platform: may be problematic to use other services
- problematical applications within the platform in the future
- possible conflict with data security questions
- Not all citizens can use these services. The service is more intended to the future
- the common authorization system, because Denmark has a better one, which is national regulated.



The i-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



Evaluation of the tasks formulated by co-ordinators in i-COIN. General evaluation of co-ordination was positive. Was mentioned, that “risk factors might affect the fulfillment of given tasks, consequently the goals might occur impossible to a achieve in projected time”. Tasks were clear, improvement was visible for partners. Also evaluation of all WP by one partner had place.

Evaluation of timing for the fulfillment of the project tasks. Evaluation of timing differs among patners. One mentioned, that timing was good, three patners mentioned, that timing was too short. One partner gave detailed argumentation for the time lag within the project: difference among partners in IT implementation level and awareness of IT solutions, different legacy systems in partner countries.

Evaluation of communication among project partners. Opinion of partners differs in evaluation of communication. Three partners evlouted communication among partners and with coordinator as good, one partner evaluated communication as desirable better, one partner noted „not very good“ and one partners‘ answer was beside the point. Few partners proposed to use SKYPE for speeding the data excahnge, because „project WEB site was an insufficient mean to promote the project communication“.

Lessons learned from 1-st phase of i-COIN project. Almost all partners mentioned positive experience from participation in this project.

- The knowledge and experience in ICT utilization and implementation in other countries is a priceless asset we have gained.
- conducting of fruitful studies regarding IT utilization in schools in Poland
- experience in project management and internal organization
- a better understanding of the role of ergonomoy and usebility in WEB site development
- mangage problems and adapt our own operation method.
- Deep understanding of partner countries differencies
- Common work with partners from different countries and cultures.
- EU-project management lessons.
- The project have been very educational

One partner mentioned , that they gained „not much“, because high achievement in IT field and e-services in their country.

What difficulties did you meet during 1-st phase of i-COIN project. Patners mentioned bothe types of problems – internal and external.

As external problems partners mentioned:

- The crucial problem are different perspectives (the i-COIN project was designed and presents an EU-centric perspective but the school representatives have a local perspective
- implementing the project together with the county administration and all municipalities was not possible due to delays of necessary decisions on political level

Internal poblems mentioned by partners:

- There are technical problems affecting partners’ organziation work.
- Response from partners.
- No respect for deadlines.
- Always make demands for both information and ask for confirmation
- To get new information during the time between organised meetings.



The i-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



- The low project budget did not allow to concentrate full time staff on the project and necessary responsibility was not always guaranteed
- lacks of time to work for the project.
- communication was sometimes problematic.
- The main difficulties have been to find a moderate solution to create the pilot platform and the pilot application
- Defining the i-Coin platform, which was very challenging.
- some organizational problems
- other partners could not really believe Denmark's favourable position concerning the common authorization system in the i-coin project

Possible ways of improvement of the situation within i-COIN project.

- additional communication software is highly recommended
- Better respect for partners
- Respect and understanding for the various working methods in different countries
- restructuring of the project team in one partner country
- a new embedding of the project in the organisation work flow of one partner country
- and revision of the practical tasks of the project
- Better organization of the workflow (internal), better/more communication between partners
- The communication and conducting / leading should be more active
- It is too ambitious to „invent“ a common pan-european authorisation system

Main arguments for the decision to participate in i-COIN project. All partners had a clear vision about project and its ideas. Understanding of i-COIN project vision and i-COIN results' and products' listing and evaluation are more or less matching. Project partners confirmed it by evaluation of i-COIN pre-project expectations and realization of them during this project. Two partners mentioned, that situation fully correspond or is even beyond expectations. Other partners mentioned that "situation partially stand-up"

Main arguments of i-COIN attractiveness were:

- i-COIN was considered to be a great opportunity to gain knowledge and valuable experience from all other partners of consortium.
- i-COIN was a great chance to create a working example of Educational Portal.
- It sounded like a good project
- Do something for our citizens
- Give our citizens possibility to use computers at the countryside
- The idea was to complete our activities in the field of broadband development
- i-COIN is about eGov problematics and communication, therefore its topic is a common and currently important field
- chance to realize some own specific plans in this field
- The topic was good, it fulfilled customer needs
- Due to having the possibility of improving our e-Services for our citizens
- Did your pre-project expectations start stand-up under the project time

Overall evaluation of phase 1 and further period in i-COIN project. Partners positively evaluated phase 1 and further period of operation in i-COIN. Useful participation in the project, very relevant project results, partners' experience in fulfillment of different activities and experience of multicultural communication were mentioned by all partners.



Summary table of the Questionnaire for the internal i-COIN evaluation of the products, achievements and management

COI POLAND	Svenljunga, Sweden	ProArbeit / EU- Office Landkreis Osterholz	Municipality of Rehna	Kymenlaakso Polytechnic, University of Applied Sciences	North Denmark EU-Office
1. What results are achieved by you in i-COIN until July, 2007? <i>Please, list them.</i>					
<p>- the prototype of solution for Klembow municipality was created and presented to local authorities and school representatives</p> <p>- public awareness of possibility and benefits of IT technology implementation in public sector [e.g. in public education] is improved due to our actions</p> <p>- Pilots requirements have been gathered and analyzed</p>	<p>Awareness in the Municipality of EU</p> <p>Awareness of other country by the citizens</p> <p>Placed out terminals in the countryside</p> <p>Performed a lot off meeting</p> <p>Statements from politicians</p> <p>Awareness for the I-COIN project</p> <p>Awareness and curiosity from the other municipalities and organisations in the Sjuhärad region and larger areas</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sensitizing Mayor and Administration of Municipality of Osterholz-Scharmbeck on enhancement of eGovernment activities. Development of a draft concept in the context of T-City contest Set up of a guideline for barrier free internet access 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> increase of knowledge in eGov topics several ideas of needs to better communication between citizens and local authorities (i.e. by questionnaires) knowledge of what might be possible to realize and what is not concrete planning for W-LAN infrastructure inside local authority concept and first steps for implementing the "i-COIN" pilot platform (and application) overview about implementation plans of the other partners further GIS implementation progress 	<p>- i-Coin platform</p> <p>- Pilot x 2 (pilot 1A and pilot 1B)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local target group Local user group Questionnaire for the target group Interviews <p>First step towards a local platform in due coordination with the partners in i-coin</p>
2. How do you evaluate <u>each</u> of them? <i>(the result in bold)</i>					
<p>Prototype creation</p> <p>The prototype is created and can be accessed via: http://83.175.186.156:778/joomlaPE/</p> <p>Awareness</p> <p>Local government authorities and schools representatives have accepted the concept of implementation i-Coin platform as a municipality education portal for Klembow municipality</p>	<p>Awareness M by hearing</p> <p>Awareness C by hearing</p> <p>The terminal By complain</p> <p>the meeting feedback from team by discussion and written report</p> <p>Statement Feedback for citizens and</p>	<p>1. Municipality was ready to engage itself in a participative process (T-City contest) which led amongst other results to draft an eGovernment concept (Result 2)</p> <p>The project contributed successfully to develop the eGovernment part in the framework of a holistic project concept to transform the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Some better ideas, how the developments on the eGov sector are advanced, good contact to other institutions working on this field We do have better ideas now of what is needed to better communication between citizens and local authorities on the eGov sector and in general. Problematic is to realize all of these points in this project for different reasons. 	<p>i-Coin platform Well functional and useful.</p> <p>Pilot Well prepared, provided and carefully planned service. Useful for citizens and for the municipality. Outputs were reported extensive</p>	<p>Very good all of them</p>



The i-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



<p>Requirements analysis The following documents were created:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. User panel report “user panel report.doc” 2. The document defining Polish Pilot main actors and requirements is enclosed in the Annex. (“functional analysis.doc”) 3. Questionnaire regarding pilot process description “Process description –questionnaire” 4. Questionnaire juxtaposition “joint questionnaires” 5. Pilot requirements juxtaposition “Pilot juxtaposition2.doc” 	<p>employed staff i-COIN project Calls, invitation to seminars Other Municipalities/ Organisations</p>	<p>municipality to a T-City (Contest of Germa Telecom). Osterholz- Scharmbeck achieved to be amongst the 10 best municipalities out of more than 70 all over Germany.</p> <p>2. The draft of a roadmap to enhance the quality of eGovernment in the municipality was set up.</p> <p>The developed draft of a roadmap will be the planning basis for the further development of the municipalities eGovernment development during the next years. Thus the project led to a sustainable result to foster customer oriented eServices.</p> <p>3. A guideline for municipalities and other web site owners to reduce barriers in accessing the site was set up.</p> <p>The guideline is actually translated into English and will be made available for all partners via the WEB site. It is based on consultations with user groups, seminar participation of the author, study of related documents and internal discussions in the project team. It will be introduced to the WEB masters of the municipalities in the county in a specific workshop.</p>	<p>3.Related to result No. 2, we know what is possible and we know what is not. There we can see that a lot of questions are not possible to be solved in this project.</p> <p>4.Planning state is almost finished. Good progress.</p> <p>5.Since the beginning of the project we have had problems to clarify the actual pilot platform respectively the application (because the platform will be developed by other specific partners). In MS 3 we have found one as we think moderate solution to implement such a pilot platform although we can not guarantee the durability.</p> <p>6.It is in this projects nature that each partner has different needs of such a pilot platform or of realizing eGov topics. So we do have an overview about the implementing plans of the others in general but not fully in detail.</p> <p>7.constitutive of existing knowledge and development there is good progress</p>		
<p>3. What product/products did you create in i-COIN until July 2007?</p>					



The i-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



<p>1. i-COIN platform utilization prototype, And following analytical documents created: 2. User panel report “user panel report.doc” 3. The document defining polish Pilot main actors and requirements is enclosed in the Annex. (“functional analysis.doc”) 4. Questionnaire regarding pilot process description “Process description –questionnaire” 5. Questionnaire juxtaposition “joint questionnaires” 6. Pilot requirements juxtaposition “Pilot juxtaposition2.doc”</p>	<p>Terminal installation Terminals-communication links Press releases Mercantiles Newsletters, brochures, project website + updated official homepage</p>	<p>1. eGovernment concept (draft) in T-City contest 2. Guideline for barrier free Internet</p>	<p>The concrete product that should be created in the i-COIN project is the pilot platform. Since July 2007 it is not finished, we have started to create the product respectively pilot application. Nevertheless we have had some results as mentioned in point 1 of this chart.</p>	<p>i-Coin platform, Pilot 1A pilot 1B</p>	<p>Besides concrete questionnaire and interviews we have ordered an IT solution for the project (the local pilot platform)</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4. How do you evaluate this/these products? Please, evaluate in 5 point system, where 1- very badly, 2- badly, 3 – moderately, 4 – good, 5 – very good

<p>Product No. 1 1 2 3 4 5 Product No. 2 1 2 3 4 5 Product No. 3 1 2 3 4 5 Product No. 4 1 2 3 4 5 Product No. 5 1 2 3 4 5 Product No. 6 1 2 3 4 5</p>	<p>Product No.1 1 2 3 4 5 Product No.2 1 2 3 4 5 Product No.3 1 2 3 4 5 Product No.4 1 2 3 4 5</p>	<p>Product No.1 1 2 3 4 5 Product No.2 1 2 3 4 5</p>	<p>Product No.1 (pilot platform, although it isn't finished) 1 2 3 4 5 (so far) <u>Product No.2</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>Product No.3</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>Product No.4</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>Product No.5</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>Product No.6</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>Product No.7</u> 1 2 3 4 5 <u>Product No.8</u> 1 2 3 4 5</p>	<p>Product No.1 i-Coin platform 1 2 3 4 5 Product No.2 Pilot 1A 1 2 3 4 5 Product No.3 Pilot 1B 1 2 3 4 5 Product No... 1 2 3 4 5</p>	<p>1) 4 2) 4 3) 5</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------

5. What are their/its strengths and weaknesses?

No. 1 It is a cost effective	1. + The citizens can	Product No.1	Product: pilot platform – pilot	Strengths: Usefull service for	An extremely good e-Service for
------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------



The i-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



<p>solution, it is easy to use, it's flexible so any functionalities can be added or altered regarding requirements. Seamless integration of i-COIN product might be difficult due to low interoperability level of legacy systems. Some works must be done in order to improve its usability and reliability.</p> <p>No. 2 User panel report was a chance to gather all information about requirements and demands. It is a coherent document comparing and contrasting answers we have received.</p> <p>No. 3 The functional analysis gave as the opportunity to create a prototype and enter next phase of software development. Mentioned functionalities were accepted by Klembow representatives.</p> <p>No 4. The questionnaire was an effective tool to gather relevant information about all i-COIN pilots and their requirements.</p> <p>No 5. The questionnaires were combined in one coherent document, however some information were missing and next polls are required.</p> <p>No. 6 It is a not creative but extremely useful paper describing pilot situation at the end of 2006, of course those documents have to be kept up-to date.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. + We got a lot of attention – the follow up from press is hard to get 3. +Easy to marketing the project –you do not know how they ends up 4. + Easy to reach the “it-citizens” through the web - How to get in contact with those who doesn't want to use IT as a tool and also how to get the right engagement from a citizen perspective 	<p><u>Strengths:</u> Involvement of relevant parts of municipality staff and consumer stakeholders in the development process</p> <p><u>Weakness:</u> Cost and time consuming implementation process which can not be achieved within I-Coin project.</p> <p>Product No.2</p> <p><u>Strengths:</u> Good overview about all relevant aspects to create userfriendly web sites</p> <p><u>Weakness:</u> Due to time consuming planning processes between municipality and county to set up a common new regional portal solution the findings will not be used during the reamaining runtime of the I-Coin project.</p>	<p>application</p> <p><u>Strengts:</u></p> <p>- pilot platform: is very flexible to be advanced and to be used for different applications</p> <p>- pilot application: we think , it could be a good idea for us although this feature is included in some DocumentManagmentSystems, and we don't know, when we will have that here, if we should keep it.</p> <p>So durability is problematic. Of course we don't know how it is accepted when it is implemented.</p> <p><u>Weakness:</u></p> <p>- pilot platform: maybe problematic to use other services or applications within the platform in the future except the planned application, maybe we get in conflict with data security questions, also depends on the technical issues that are demanded</p> <p>- pilot application: this feature is included in some DocumentManagmentSystems, and we don't know, when we will have that here, if we should keep it.</p> <p>So durability is problematic. Of course we don't know how it is accepted when it is implemented.</p>	<p>citizens and it helps municipality workers at their jobs. Weaknesses: Not all citizens can use these services. The service is more intended to the future.</p>	<p>the target group. The weekness is the common authorization system, because Denmark has a better one, which is national regulated</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



<p>6. How do you evaluate tasks formulated by co-ordinators in i-COIN? Please, argue evaluation</p>					
<p>Tasks are formulated clearly and properly however the risk factors might affect the fulfillment of given tasks, consequently the goals might occur impossible to a achieve in projected time.</p>	<p>We wait for instructions from WP5 coordinator</p>	<p>All tasks were well explained and arrived in time.</p>	<p>In general there was no problem to work the tasks formulated by the co-ordinator. Mostly we agreed about what to do during the meetings. Sometimes we had questions about the conversion. Especially during the first milestone we sometimes had wished to get more guidance for more clarification.</p>	<p>WP1: Partly failed. Wp1 didn't give much of technical help for wp 2, which was its taks to do. WP3: Relatively successful. Not that active WP4: Very active. Tried to reach the results that are/were required. WP5: Really quiet. We haven't hear anything of this wp</p>	<p>In the beginning not very clear, but the improvements are indeed visible as we begin to know eachother</p>
<p>7. How do you evaluate timing for the fulfillment of the project tasks? Please, explain.</p>					
<p>The project is obviously behind the schedule due to the following facts: - IT implementation level in different courtiers that participate in i-COIN project is divergent - Awareness of IT solutions is different also. - - The i-COIN platform might require more work to implement in one courtiers than in others. Since some legacy systems are not as interoperable as it is required for „seamless integration“ The platform creation was delayed consequently some other tasks were postponed</p>	<p>We wait for instructions from WP5 coordinator</p>	<p>The timing was almost acceptable. The „almost“ is probably due to our insufficient participation in project meetings which led sometimes to unclear interpretations of tasks</p>	<p>Having in mind not only have been busy in this project the timing sometimes was very tight. In general it has been enough time.</p>	<p>Partly there have been enough time to fullfill the tasks, but sometimes timeing have been too short. Ralust of that we are late from the schedule. Sometimes the reason is simply the lack of time</p>	<p>A more exact timing good perhaps had resulted in more speed in the project. However a slow start has now resulted in a better mutual understandment of each role in the partership</p>
<p>8. How do you evaluate communication among project partners? Please, explain.</p>					
<p>Communication between project partners is good, all partners have the ability to clearly inform about their demands, however the speed of data exchange might be improved if more communication software types were used for example skype, icq, or msn. In all</p>	<p>We wait for instructions from WP5 coordinator</p>	<p>From our experiences in transnational projects the project WEB site was an insufficient means to promote the project communication since it was more or less a top down tool. The use of a communication tool like skype</p>	<p>The communication to the Leadpartner was good. Maybe as mentioned during the first milestone we had communicated rather seldom. Most communication happend via email, only exceptional we used the phone. The communication</p>	<p>Communication between partners have been very good. We have had lots of help when ever we have needed it.</p>	<p>Not very good due to the unclear role of each partner in the beginning. However, improving</p>



The i-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



<p>projects we have taken a part those solutions enabled us to accelerate date exchange within the consortiums.</p>		<p>and a real content management system would have been a good idea to enable a better communication.</p>	<p>among the partners was very seldom outside the meetings. Now in the last milestones where we have had and have to forward the implementation of the pilot platform, communication among the responsible partners became more and more intensive and effective.</p>		
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

9. What did you learn, as organization from 1-st phase of i-COIN project?

<p>The knowledge and experience in ICT utilization and implementation in other countries is a priceless asset we have gained. The tasks we were given enabled as to conduct fruitful studies regarding IT utilization in schools in Poland</p>	<p>We know now more how to move the project forward, How to organize your own internal organization The importance of communication between each partner and WP owner, both e-mail and most important the personal contact and meetings</p>	<p>The project led to sensitize in the sense of a better understanding of the role of ergonomoy and usebility in WEB site development.</p>	<p>As an organization we learned lots of things already mentioned in point 1 and 2 of this chart. We also had to mangage problems and adapt our own operation method. The eGov topic is very different to handle for each of the partners. We all have different basic conditions to implement eServices. So it maybe is the big challange to find the community there.</p>	<p>How to work with partner from different countries and cultures. How to manage EU-projects. The project have been very educational.</p>	<p>Not much. Denmark is way ahead on this area compared to most of the other partners</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

10. What difficulties did you meet during 1-st phase of i-COIN project?

<p>There are technical problems that might affected our work. The crucial problem are different perspectives (the i-COIN project was designed and presents an EU-centric perspective but the school representatives have a local perspective consequently overwhelming those difficulties was a laborious process</p>	<p>Response from partners. No respect for deadlines. Always make demands for both information and ask for confirmation To get news information during the time between organised meetings. Information that should be used in the newsletter's and website. Information about the project in local media and also from those who is working in the project</p>	<p>The low project budget did not allow to concentrate full time staff on the project. Thus the necessary responsibilty was not always guaranteed . Staff changed and swome meetingswere not attended. Further the project implementation was hamperedby the fact, that the original approach of implementing the project together with the county administration and all municipalities was not possible due to delays of necessary decisions on political level.</p>	<p>As an organization we often had lacks of time to work for the project. Also communication was sometimes problematic. The main diffeculties have been to find a moderate solution to create the pilot platform and the pilot application (the concept and realization). Of course we have had problems in understanding the idea of i-COIN at first.</p>	<p>Defining the i-Coin platform, which was very challecing. Also some organizational problems, e.g with hiring projecy leader for the project.</p>	<p>That the other partners could not really believe Denmarks favourable position concerning the common authorization system in the i-coin project</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



11. How situation could be improved?					
The works that have been done should produce a boost for our project. The abovementioned utilization of other additional communication software is highly recommended.	Better respect for partners Respect and understanding for the various working methods in different countries ask instead of saying or doing nothing!	The situation is improved by a restructuring of the project team and a new embedding of the project in the organisation work flow and a revision of the practical tasks of the project.	Better organization of the workflow (internal), better/more communication between partners (simple example confirmation of email receipt)	Maybe the communication and conducting / leading should be more active.	Hard to say. It is too ambitious to „invent“ a common pan-european authorisation system
12. Do you remember, why did you decide to participate in i-COIN? Please, mention the arguments.					
I-COIN was considered to be a great opportunity to gain knowledge and valuable experience form all other partners of consortium. We also thought that i-COIN was a great chance to create a working example of Educational Portal. That kind of portal may become an important improvement of Polish education system.	It sounded like a good project Wanted to work with other countries Do something for our citizens Give our citizens possibility to use computers at the countryside	The idea was to complete our activities in the field of broadband development (especially in the Baltic Broadband Project) by additional practical work on enhancing broadband content	i-COIN is about eGov problematics and communication, therefore its topic is a common and currently important field. This could be one reason why Municipality of Rehna has decided to participate. Also the chance to realize some own specific plans in this field we should have in mind as a reason. Not less important is Svenljunga kommun as Leadpartner, while Municipality of Rehna and Svenljunga kommun have a general partnership agreements.	The topic was good, it fullfilled customer needs	Due to having the possibily of improving our e-Services for our citizens
13. Did your pre-project expectations start stand-up under the project time?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, situation is even beyond expectations • Yes, situation fully stand-up • Situation partially stand-up • No, situation is contrary to expectations • No, situation fall short of expectations • Difficult to evaluate 	<p>X! Yes, situation is even beyond expectations</p> <p>X! Yes, situation fully stand-up</p> <p>Situation partially stand-up</p> <p>No, situation is contrary to expectations</p> <p>No, situation fall short of expectations</p> <p>Difficult to evaluate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situation partially stand-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, situation is even beyond expectations • Yes, situation fully stand-up • Situation partially stand-up • No, situation is contrary to expectations • No, situation fall short of expectations Difficult to evaluate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, situation is even beyond expectations • Yes, situation fully stand-up • Situation partially stand-up • No, situation is contrary to expectations • No, situation fall short of expectations Difficult to evaluate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, situation is even beyond expectations • Yes, situation fully stand-up • Situation partially stand-up • No, situation is contrary to expectations • No, situation fall short of expectations Difficult to evaluate
14. What is overall evaluation of 1-st phase of i-COIN project?					
The platform software that was created must have fulfilled very divergent requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have the right focus i our project! We <u>listen</u> to the citizens and 	The participation was useful in order to rise our awareness on the practical and user related	We had to mangage different problems and adapt our own operation method to find the final	Nice and good. Not completely what we expected, but still successfully handeled.	The fundamental overall goal of i-coin is not a common „problem“ or challenge in the partnership.



The i-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



<p>consequently the created software is not easy to use and require much work to implement All actions taken by consortium were reasonable however the speed of achieving our goals is below expectations The i-COIN project still has a great potential to fully stand up all it members' expectations.</p>	<p>SME's thoughts about how to get the best e-services on the internet and then implement. Really working with the "down under" perspective.</p>	<p>aspects of public services' web sites</p>	<p>solution that is part of the project proposal. Maybe it was formed not clear enough there. The eGov topic is very different to handle for each of the partners. We all have different basic conditions to implement eServices. So it maybe was/is the big challange to find the community there. E-Gov problems are still a big topic and even after the i-COIN project Municipality of Rehna has things to do on this field. Overall the work in this project is interesting and well communicated.</p>		<p>Thats one of the reasons why there is a lack of mutual understandment and communcation between the partners</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



Interview of the pilot platform in I-COIN project partner countries

Type of interviews: Semi structured interview
Year : 2007

The answers were received from Finland, Kotka, University of Applied Sciences and Germany, Rehna municipality. Interviewees were rather different in both countries. In Finland prevailed municipal inhabitants, but interviews in Rehna municipality were made with mayors of Dechow, Köchelstorf, Utecht, Carlow, Groß Molzahn. Generally were interviewed 8 persons in Finland and 5 in Germany. Totally were made 15 semi structure interviews. In the interview were represented 2 types of e-service users – inhabitants and authority representatives. Semi-structured interview included 8 general questions about reasons, frequency, problems and alternatives of the use of certain e-platform also interviewees were asked to evaluate main characteristics of e-service.

Why did You decide to use this e-service?

Main reasons for the use of e-service are direct access to information and direct contact with the employees of the local authority.

How often do You use the service?

The answers to the frequency of the use are various – from “rarely” to “twice per week” and “almost every day”. According to the information rarely e-service are using municipal inhabitants in comparison with municipal employees, which are using e-platform more frequent.

What is Your opinion about e-service after using it? Why?

In this question opinions of informants divided into two contrary groups. If inhabitants were more or less satisfied with e-platform’s information with the slight notes about missing residential information and development plans, so municipal mayors’ opinions were mainly negative, but concerned DSL, renewal, lack of further description of things.

Did You meet problems while using the e-service?

Almost all informants told that they hadn’t problems using the e-service. Just the note about map base, which don’t work in all computers and above mentioned information about DSL were mentioned. Both notes didn’t show series e-service use problems.

Is there something in the service that should be improved?

There were several recommendations what should be improved both for public use and official use. Notes differ very much in partner countries. In Finland (inhabitants) mainly asked to improve information details and availability of it, while in Germany were relevant questions of updating and “closer description”.

Do You know other similar services? Do You use them?



To this question, which mainly indicates experience of the informants of the use of similar e-services, we received many negative answers. Informants couldn't indicate similar services with the exception of one informant, which mentioned bank service. Another answer positive answer indicated "casual" (services), which is difficult to interpret.

What e-services/platforms you should mention as most successful ? Why ?

As most successful e-services/platforms were mentioned bank and insurance business, travel tickets, travel sale and route services. All answers were from Finland. German municipal employees didn't answer this question.

Characteristics of e-service features important to the e-services/platforms user.

Most important characteristics are:

- Information Accuracy
- Easy to find information I'm looking for
- Information is up-to-date
- Information can be collected any time

Less important characteristics are:

- Information can be viewed wider
- Detailed information
- Topics are covering every need
- No time constraint

Characteristic "Large amount of information" was evaluated as most not important.

Answers by country- partners:

Finland University of Applied Sciences i-Coin & Lobistech -project Kotka	Germany, Rehna municipality
1. Why did You decide to use this e-service?	
-I wanted to check the information which concerns my house - I have an estate and I wanted to see information - I heard about the service while it was on its way, and it got my interest. - Common interest - I got a hint and I decided to try I heard about it from my friend - I heard about it in my workplace and I became curious	- it is more efficient - direct access to the information - fast information - uncomplicated - no long ways to go - Because I work in the city of Rehna, I prefer to get in touch personally with the employees of the local authority (comment: it is located in Rehna). - during vacations, weekend, at closing time (after work) - Because it is fast and uncoplicated - you can get fast information



1. How often do You use the service?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rarely - This is the first time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Just this once, because likely the information will not change, so there are no use. - Pretty often, almost daily - Rarely - Once in a while = rarely - Once in a year - Once or twice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can't express in numbers - if it is necessary anyway. - as necessary - once to twice a week - once to twice a week - twice a week
3. What is Your opinion about e-service after using it? Why?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The page is easy to use and illustrative - It's good that you can check your own real estate information, by your self - Operating ok, but where do I need this information? Could the service give more information about the residential environment? Especially about the future plans in the area. - Work very logically, but some of the information was missing (did not show all my property) - The service don't offer me anything new - Easy, simple, handy, in some cases useful - Easy - Responds to the expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I use Internet very seldom, if I do, it is more indirect trough other persons. - Sometimes it is informative. - In Utecht (comment: community name) we have big problems with the broadband connection (DSL). - I know that all members of the community parliament do have an Internet connection and are interessted, but there is the problem with DSL. - seldom used, - no closer description possible - It is already very helpful to find statutes / rules there, so you avoid time-consuming searching in folders. - It is absolute upgradeable.
4. Did You meet problems while using the e-service?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No problems - No. Just in the beginning I didn't understand that I have to click the house before I can see the information - No - No - The map base don't work in all computers. Some of the information is incorrect. - Not really. In the beginning some of the information was incorrect (the service told that I own 16 hectares more land then I really do, just 1 km from our lot), but now the information has been corrected. - No 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - nothing important - seldom used, - no closer description possible - bad Internet Connection - DSL - bad Internet Connection - DSL



- No			
5. Is there something in the service that should be improved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, I don't think so - What means "effectiveness number"? - The service didn't tell the interest share of the property or other owners (if there are more than one) - No - The program should convince the user that even that you are using your bank passwords, the program does not inflict you bank account in anyway. People usually perceive bank passwords to be used only in bank business. - I missed map-service (provided by city), where you could find more detailed information -No 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - absolute the up-to-dateness !!!! - it can't be that very old informations won't be updated ! - seldom used, - no closer description possible - I am satisfied with it. - I am satisfied with it. 	
6. Do You know other similar services? Do You use them?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don't know any other similar ones - Bank services are good, makes business easier - No - No and no - No - I don't know any - I don't know or use. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - yes - casual <p>No answers</p>	
7. What e-services/platforms you should mention as most successful ? Why ?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bank services (e.g. bill paying) and ticket service. Ticket service makes the ticket buying so simple. - Those which are working well and are reliable. I do e.g. shopping and run bank and insurance business. - Travel sale and route service - My favourites are bank services, time schedules, possibility to buy travel tickets, e-mail, information from my own professional field, etc. - Bank, appointment reservation, different kind of order-services - In universal point of view e-services that banks are offering are good examples 		No answers	
8. Which of provided in the card e-service features are important for You and which not?			
Important	Not important	Important	Not important
Information Accuracy		Information Accuracy	



The *i*-COIN Project

Project part-financed by the European Union



8	0	5	0
Easy to find information I'm looking for		Easy to find information I'm looking for	
8	0	5	0
Topics are covering every need		Topics are covering every need	
3	5	5	0
Information is up-to-date		Information is up-to-date	
8	0	5	0
Large amount of information		Large amount of information	
0	8	3	2
No time constraint		No time constraint	
3	5	5	0
Information can be viewed wider		Information can be viewed wider	
6	2	5	0
Information can be collected any time		Information can be collected any time	
8	0	5	0
Detailed information		Detailed information	
5	3	5	0