

Evaluation Summary Report

**Proposal :** 611688  
**Acronym :** Consensus  
**Program :** FP7  
**Call :** FP7-ICT-2013-10  
**Funding scheme :** Small or medium-scale focused research project -STREP - CP-FP-INFOSO  
**Duration :** 30 months  
**Activity :** ICT-10-5.4 - ICT for Governance and Policy Modelling

**Consensus**  
Multi-Objective Decision Making Tools through Citizen Engagement

**Proposal submitted by :**

N°	Proposer name	Country	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
1	INSTITUTE OF COMMUNICATION AND COMPUTER SYSTEMS	Greece	678,700	18.17	551,700	21.30
2	IBM ISRAEL - SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LTD	Israel	1,083,500	29.01	596,000	23.01
3	INTERNATIONALES INSTITUT FUER ANGEWANDTE SYSTEMANALYSE	Austria	495,625	13.27	388,093	14.98
4	ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA	Greece	370,375	9.91	295,656	11.42
5	UNIVERSITAT KONSTANZ	Germany	418,400	11.20	323,800	12.50
6	OXFAM ITALIA ONLUS	Italy	166,200	4.45	101,100	3.90
7	WWF - WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE	Switzerland	166,920	4.47	103,560	4.00
8	EUROPEAN UNION ROAD FEDERATION	Belgium	355,806	9.52	230,009	8.88
	<b>Total</b>		<b>3,735,526</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,589,918</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Abstract :**

Every real-world planning problem, especially in governance and policy-making, possesses several objectives that are typically subject to inherent conflicts with underlying tradeoffs to be discovered. Policy makers are in need of proper tools that will utilize an overall analytical process, that is, assist in modelling the real-world planning process, automatically obtain the best attainable tradeoffs, and facilitate efficient exploration in order to reach a final decision on which policy to implement. Consensus will strive to model existing real-world use-cases within the relevant policy-making context, and consequently employ measurable quantifiers in order to investigate how and whether preferable tradeoffs can be identified. Those quantifiers will be sought in multiple realms – such as analytical models, numerical simulations, statistical tools and even public opinion evaluators – in order to link the domain data to the set of objectives, and by that to reflect the expected success-rate of policies and their implementation. Furthermore, Consensus intends to investigate the balance shift of the objectives, in scenarios where certain resources are being deployed to primarily address one of them through EU- or international-level policies. This investigation is meant to cover two important real-world use-cases: the one dealing with Biofuels and Climate Change (EU Renewable Energy Directive), and the other dealing with Transportation Networks (trans-European transport network guidelines). Consensus will also seek the citizens' involvement in policy making according to this scheme, since their input can potentially become highly valuable in various stages, from gathering the necessary data, through formulating public opinion as one of the objectives in the model, to eventually playing the role of exploring the attained tradeoffs and contributing to their weighing.

**Evaluation :**

<b>1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call) ( Threshold 3.0/5 ; Weight 1.00 )</b>	<b>Mark:</b>
---	--------------

<p>The proposal presents a holistic approach to the solution of important social problems, integrating enabling technologies such as simulation, optimization and decision making, social analytics and crowdsourcing, games, visualization and human-computer interfaces (HCI).</p> <p>The concept is well thought through and fully in line with the Call 5.4. The objectives are coherent, realistic and clearly described. There is significant novelty in the approach of breaking complex problems into sub-objectives, resolving each one separately, and then merging partial solutions and resolving conflicts using Pareto-based optimizations.</p> <p>The two case studies (biofuels and climate change, and transportation networks) are well chosen, addressing important problems with significant social impact. A strong emphasis is placed on the active involvement of the public (including young people through gamification).</p> <p>The state of the art is generally well described, although lacking in some areas such as gamification, and includes a discussion of relevant projects. Advances beyond the state of the art are identified primarily in respect of analytics of social data and visualization. Policy modelling in the two case study domains will also be advanced.</p> <p>The S/T methodology is well described. The workplan is thorough and well structured, with clear milestones and appropriate attention to interdependencies between work packages. The timing discrepancy between the final version of the software components and architecture (at M30) and the delivery of the final integrated system (at M26) is not explained.</p>	5.00
---	------

<p><b>2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management ( Threshold 3.0/5 ; Weight 1.00 )</b></p>	<b>Mark:</b>
<p>The management structures and procedures are appropriate for the work proposed. In particular, the designation of a Data Protection Coordinator is well-justified for a project involving extensive interaction with the public. Risk management is well addressed and comprehensive. But the role of the Exploitation Manager is not explained.</p> <p>The individual partners are of high quality and appropriately qualified to fulfil their responsibilities in the allocated tasks. All partners have distinct responsibilities and roles. The active involvement of partners that can directly address the public is noteworthy.</p> <p>The consortium as a whole is complementary and well balanced. The coordinator (NTUA) is well qualified in both scientific and administrative aspects and has significant experience in managing international projects.</p> <p>The resources requested are overall well justified and allocated appropriately between partners and work packages. However, the high allocation to Work Package 4 compared to Work Package 3 requires further justification.</p>	5.00

<p><b>3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results ( Threshold 3.0/5 ; Weight 1.00 )</b></p>	<b>Mark:</b>
<p>The results will potentially have important benefits at European and possibly international level, primarily through improving the use of policy-making tools in decision-making. The potential impact of the research is substantial and is convincingly explained in the proposal. This includes a very detailed plan to mobilise the end-user networks.</p> <p>The dissemination plan is well formulated and detailed but foresees only limited activity towards government officials, an important audience.</p> <p>The exploitation strategy is well presented, focusing on individual partner activity. However, the recognition of the exploitable assets and the market and competition analysis lack detail.</p> <p>IPR issues are addressed and will be elaborated further in the consortium agreement. In view of the proposed approach, ethical issues are thoroughly and convincingly considered.</p>	4.50

<p><b>4. Remarks ( Threshold 10.0/15 )</b></p>	<b>TOTAL:</b>
<p>In the event of the proposal proceeding to negotiation, the Evaluators recommend that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The workplan should introduce a final, third version of the integrated prototype at M30</li> <li>2) The consortium either adjust or justify the resources allocated to Work Package 4</li> <li>3) Deliverables such as D2.2 and D6.1.X be made public.</li> <li>4) The dissemination strategy should include specific activities towards government officials and citizens (via the organisation of promotional events).</li> <li>5) The exploitation plan should be elaborated to take better account of the market and competition.</li> </ol>	14.50

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? *(If yes, please complete an ethical issues report form (EIR))*

N

*For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments. Half point scores may be given :*

**0-** *The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information*

**1- Poor.** *The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.*

**2- Fair.** *While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.*

**3- Good.** *The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.*

**4- Very Good.** *The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.*

**5- Excellent.** *The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*