Proposal: ICT Converging on Law: Next Generation Services for Citizens, Enterprises, Public Administration and Policymakers.
Acronym: ICT4LAW
Punti acquisiti: 4.79

Evaluator 1

Validity and originality of the scientific content of the proposal and/or the innovative nature of the methodologies. *	4	The proposal describes a timely and highly needed research and development. The frequent changes in law and vast differences between local laws make it rather difficult to create automated systems. The proposal describes clearly the need and the approach by which significant advancements cane be made towards satisfactory solution. The proposal provides clear explanation of available expertise, its linking with the proposal, the way outcomes could be assessed and how the rick would be managed.
Quality and reliability of the technical-scientific-commercial repercussions on the activities of the participating enterprises. *	4.5	The participant organisations seem to have adequate level of expertise and can be seen as reliable in delivering the outcomes. Appropriate level of academia-industry combination is used, though the law expertise could be reduced little bit and little bit more computer technology expertise could be added. Also, reliance on contractual expertise could be reduced.
Capacity of the proponent to implement the proposed project, on the basis of the elements contained in participant's CVs. *	4.5	The proponent participants have excellent record of research and funding. They have the capacity to manage the project and undertake the proposed research to successful outcomes.
Capacity of the co-proponent and of additional subjects to implement the proposed project, on the basis of participants' competences and past experiences. *	4	The co-proponents are mostly adequate to provide required expertise. Some information is missing about participants for couple of co-proponents, but overall information about them in the project provides enough information to assess their capacities.
Quality of the organisational and managerial structure of the proposed project and feasibility of the proposed project from an economic-financial viewpoint. *	3.5	Overall organisation ana managerial structure is clear and satisfactory. I have some concern over too much law expertise and somewhat less ICT expertise, that is required in the project. There is also too much reliance on the contractual services. My suggestion would be to include some locally available ICT expertise and reduce some contractual law expertise.

Evaluator 2

Validity and originality of the scientific content of the proposal and/or the innovative nature of the methodologies. *	3.5	- The selected subject area is interesting and full of complex challenges. It is an area where significant advances can be made, and an interesting research subject. - The project proposes very ambitious inter-disciplinary activities and goals, spanning between Legislation, Computer Science and Economics. While the connections between the first two disciplines are clearly elaborated, the connection of the last one to the first two is not sufficiently elaborated. It is not clearly demonstrated that "Agent-based simulation of enterprises" can isolate the contribution of legal norms to the development of enterprises. I.e. it is not clearly demonstrated that the connection of Economic development to Legal norms can be analyzed automatically. - The State of the Art survey mentions several projects, but doesn't make a statement what is the impact of these projects on the proposal and how their results will be used. For example, ESTRELLA provides a standard Legal Knowledge Interchange Framework that is very relevant for this proposal, but no intent to reuse ESTRELLA results is described. - Several important related EU projects (eg ALIS, Athena, eJustice, R4eGov, SemanticGov, JUMAS) are not even mentioned.

| Quality and reliability of the technical-scientific-commercial repercussions on the activities of the participating enterprises. * | 4 | 4 Quality and reliability of activities (technical-scientific-commercial)
- The proposal states a very ambitious research/prototyping programme in the subject area.
- The Work Packages are well-rounded and comprehensive, especially the set of proposed deliverables.
- The feasibility and usefulness of some planned activities is not sufficiently demonstrated. For example WP10 "Opinion Monitoring for the Law Domain" states that automated public opinion surveys of blogs and other web content will be used to provide feedback for future legislation drafting. Two doubts are:
1. People commonly express dissatisaction with a law not because it is bad or unclearly stated, but because it obligates them to do certain things. Laws cannot satisfy everybody, and the WP doesn't purport to do statistical evaluation of whether a law satisifies the majority of citizens.
2. People could be dissatisfied with a life situation that is precipitated by a certain law very indirectly, and these people often don't even know it was precipitated by that law. In that case the chance that automatic analysis could identify the articles of law that precipitated the situation are very low.
- Some activities are not described in sufficient detail to clarify how the activity will be executed and to understand the activity's approach. Eg it is unclear why "natural language processing and agent based reasoning" is needed to perform normative consolidation (building a new normative document including all the modifications done along time). Changes to norms are expressed as simple text manipulation operations (remove, insert and replace articles), and no Artificial Intelligence is required to perform them. |

Capacity of the proponent to implement the proposed project, on the basis of the elements contained in participant's CVs. *	4	- The CVs of proponents staff are very detailed and demonstrate knowledge and experience in the subject areas. - However, the proponents experience in the subject areas is not extremely strong and requires complementation with other resources. That is why the use of subcontractors is proposed. - The use of subcontractors (in addition to proponents and co-proponents) is an interesting feature of the proposal. "Essential part of the project are also institutions outside Piedmont, which will be involved via collaboration contracts constituting a substantial part of the overall budget". Such subcontracts will play a crucial role in project execution, in particular ISTC CNR in the area of Ontology and e-Government procedures and Xerox Research Center in the area of Natural Language Processing. - I want to point this fact to the evaluation/negotiation committee, since I am not sure whether the proposed subcontractors have committed themselves to the proposal, and whether such practice is acceptable under the rules of the present call. - The involvement of subcontractors (16% of the funding) sufficiently complements the proponents.
Capacity of the co-proponent and of additional subjects to implement the proposed project, on the basis of participants' competences and past experiences. *	3.8	- Co-proponents are not very strong in the areas of research, with the exception of the CELI private research center. They consist of 3 software houses with no special strengths in the core research areas, and a provider of financial services (for industrial case-study). - However, the experience of co-proponents is sufficiently strong in the particular duties that are accorded to them (eg web crawling for one of the co-proponents) - Co-proponents are complemented sufficiently by subcontractors.

Quality of the organisational and managerial structure of the proposed project and feasibility of the proposed project from an economic-financial viewpoint. *	4.5	- This is a very complex project with 15 Work Packages, 1200 person/month total effort and 5400 kEUR budget. - Sufficient project control structure is established, including: Technical Project Committee (TPC), Coordination and Control Commission (CCC), Observatory Board - The importance of Intellectual Property management in such complex situation is acknowledged, but no IP management plan or approach is described. - Sufficient Dissemination connections are indentified and activities are planned. - The breakdown of WP work amongst project partners is clearly stated. - Some deliverables are not described and justified in sufficient detail. Eg WP06.D2 "Implementation of the ontology management system": not clear why is such system required, and what will it provide beoynd all the ontology management systems that already exist. - The proposed project duration (36m) is adequate for the project's purpose. - A contradicting statement is made about the budget allocated to subcontractors. One one hand it is stated as 20.4% of 64% (i.e. 13%), on the other hand as 16%. The actual percentage is 15.7% (850k EUR of 5400k EUR) - The budget is broken down to great level of detail, down to individual people and person/months. However, this information is not stated in a form that is easy to digest or summarize. - the amount of "General expenses" allocated may be too high (eg 20k EUR per year for Dipartimento di scienze giuridiche, and 32k EUR per year for Dipartimento di Informatica, both of Universitа degli Studi di Torino). The total General expenses are 632k or 11.7% of the project budget.

Commento del nucleo: Convergence is the key in this project, which aims to obtain a smooth fusion between the law realm and society, via the use of state of the art techniques from the technological world. The combination of ontologies and semantic web, natural language processing, web 2.0, and agents, makes for a highly innovative project that can quite have an impact.