How a librarian uses the Structured Consultation tool:

Let us assume the librarian has collected enough information about the arguments raised in the debate about the Copyright Green Paper so far. He / she now wants to give his / her view about the consultation. With the help of IMPACT, participants can comment on policy proposals in a highly structured way, helping to ensure that their comments are actually recognised and evaluated in the analysis of the consultation (in contrast to current practice with no structure imposed on the comments, but also little impact on the results).

To comment on the Green Paper questions, the librarian chooses the 'Structured Consultation' from the start screen of the IMPACT toolbox. He / she clicks on the link 'Start now!' in the 'Structured Consultation' box which can found in the lower right corner of the screen and is taken to an online survey about Question 9 of the Green Paper, the issue of scanning of works by libraries.

➔ *Click on 'Start now!' in the 'Structured Consultation' box to start the Structured Consultation tool.*

The Structured Consultation tool offers a structured dialogue to enter feedback on a policy proposal. The user starts by entering his or her name on the first screen. On the second screen, the tool asks for feedback on the circumstances that have been mentioned as justification of the proposed action. Each circumstance is displayed in the form of statements, and the user can state whether he / she agrees, disagrees or finds it is not applicable. A free text field is offered to add other circumstances that might be relevant to the proposal. On this page as on subsequent pages, the user is presented with default choices given by the tool. For instance, for circumstances, the default is 'agree'.

In the case the user does not accept the default, a digression pops up and asks more questions to further justify the point of dissent. Having read the arguments in the argumentation map, the librarian notices that the digression asks about the arguments brought forward to establish the circumstances as relevant for the proposal.

After answering all questions and digressions, the librarian clicks on the button 'Next' at the bottom of the screen and is taken to the next screen. The second screen is about the consequences stated to follow from the action. Again, the user is asked about his / her agreement or disagreement with the statements. The third screen is the last screen with questions. Here, the user can indicate whether in his / her opinion the action promotes, demotes or is neutral with regard to certain social values that have been cited as being affected by the proposal. He/she can also indicate the respective value is not worthwhile considering. Again, a digression pops up whenever further clarification is necessary. Having clicked 'Next' at the bottom of this screen, the user is taken to a summary page to review all his / her answers, and is asked to submit the responses for consideration in the consultation.

➔ *Once you have answered all questions and submitted your responses, please click on the 'Home' icon at the top of the right bar with icons to get back to the start screen of the IMPACT toolbox.*

➔ *You can check the argument network map to see that your opinion has been added as 'weighting' to the justification for the proposal. To do so, in the issue map choose section 3 – subsection 3.1 – question Q9, and in the argument network map for this question click on the small blue circle at the upper left corner of the text box reading 'clarify the law and exceptions to allow libraries to scan materials' (highlighted by a bold outline). In the text box that*

pops up, a number is displayed counting how many participants have agreed or disagreed with the respective premise of the argument, including your answers in the Structured Consultation.

➔ *Please answer our online survey about the IMPACT tools (http://ofb.zebralog.de/policy-argumentation/) or try out the other tools / the role as policy analyst.*

➔ *Please turn to the next page for instructions for using the Argument Reconstruction tool!*