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I. Background

A central element in the creation of the Commission's new web presence is the building of a common, task-based information architecture. To ensure that such a common architecture would be accepted and actually implemented throughout the institution, a rigorous and inclusive process (starting in 2014) of user research and testing was conducted, involving both the DGs and the people using our websites. This process led to the establishment of a top-level architecture (highest level of menu labels), consisting of 15 content classes giving access to the 77 Commission-wide user tasks collectively identified by all DGs and ranked through an online user poll.

The poll results revealed 6 user tasks as being the most important for respondents, irrespective of where they work and where they live. They also revealed in precise, statistical terms the main audiences interacting with the European Commission online.

Further polls have since been conducted to establish the most important subtasks underneath certain classes and tasks.

---

1 A task is what people come to do on our website. Examples include applying for a research grant, finding details on a new legislative proposal, finding people (eg contacting a Commissioner), or looking for information about recruiting staff abroad.

2 Executive summary on building the information architecture:

3 Carried out in 24 languages with 106,792 valid responses. Factsheet on the May 2014 top tasks poll:
Task performance measurement

A rigorous, task-based approach to the management of the new web presence requires continuous (iterative) testing and improvement, based on sound metrics that measure how easily and quickly our audiences can complete their tasks on the Commission's websites. These metrics are provided through task performance measurement tests resulting in an indicator known as the task performance indicator (TPI). Task performance measurement tests (per class) were launched in 2016. The first round of testing sets the baseline against which future performance of each class will be measured.

The testing process involves recording and analysing 15-20 one-on-one remote sessions (about 60 minutes) observing and measuring how well representative users can complete a prioritised set of task instructions. The instructions are real task scenarios based on a validated, ranked task list and developed together with DG stakeholders (see overview p. 11). Analysing the results of the tests reveals patterns in people’s behaviour as they seek to complete the tasks. These patterns allow us to make sense of the data. Testing with 15-20 people is required to get reliable and stable patterns.

Each participant starts the test from the same page. During the introduction, it is made clear to them that although the test starts from this page, they are free to use the internet as they would usually do (Google, Bing, etc.). To keep results comparable over iterations, the starting page needs to be repeatable. In the Commission, the agreed starting page is the Commission homepage: (ec.europa.eu/index_en.htm).

Using task performance measurement as a continuous-improvement management model offers clear benefits, including:

- **easily-understood indicators** of success, failure and time on task completion.
- **insight into both the current situation and how to improve it.** For example, where testing shows that a particular task has a success rate of 60%, the data will also show what caused the 40% of failures. Addressing and fixing the causes of failure should result in a clear improvement in the success rate when the task is tested again.
- **evidence-based action plan.** Between iterations, and based on the findings of the tests, an action plan can be made to improve content, usability and navigation, focusing on the most urgent issues first.

---

4 See Annex 2: Test user profiles

5 Prioritisation is based on evidence of user needs, balanced against the organisation’s goals.

6 See Annex 3: Stability of results

7 This was the first round of tests done on the European Commission (EC) home page design with the two tabs: “Commission and its priorities” and “Policies, information and services”
The class Law

The following sets of data were used to develop the test instructions for task performance measurement:

1. Data from work on the top-level architecture for the EC new web presence

The class Law contains the following tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Total Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EU law, rules, treaties, judgments</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Track policy and law making process, updates</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>National implementation of EU law, infringements</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Competition (state aid, cartels, mergers, anti-trust)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Initiate, contribute to law making (public consultations, citizen’s initiative)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Privacy, data protection</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Crime, fraud, corruption, human trafficking</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Judicial cooperation between EU countries, recognition of judgments</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Data on subtasks from user surveys

User evidence on detailed subtasks was gathered through user surveys asking two open questions:

- What information about [task description] do you need most?
- Why do you need this information? What do you usually do with it?

Six surveys were carried out:
1. Combination of tasks 1, 13, 44
2. Task 22
3. Task 38
4. Task 49
5. Task 56
6. Task 65

When the TPI instructions were being prepared for the test, the analysis and results of the user surveys for tasks 49, 56 and 65 were not available.

---

8 Executive summary on building the information architecture: 

9 In the absence of a full Task Identification survey for the content class Law
According to the analysis and results of the user surveys for tasks 1, 13, 22, 38 and 44, the most frequently mentioned subtasks were:

- Find legislative documents (law, rules, directives, decisions)
- Non-jargon summaries of laws (how does it affect me?)
- Overview of all legislation relating to a specific subject
- Track the status of a specific proposal or piece of legislation in the law-making process
- Track the timing of upcoming legislation [when it will be announced, adopted, etc.]
- Implementation of directives by member states
- Public consultation
- Process of law-making (who is involved, stages)
- Case law (ECJ decisions, important cases)

3. Detailed audience profiles

Data on audience profiles for the content class Law were available from the 2014 EC-wide task identification survey.\(^\text{10}\)

The list of class Law subtasks, test instructions and detailed audiences were validated in workshops with DGs OLAF, COMP, HOME, JUST, GROW, SANTE and SG.

\(^\text{10}\) Overview of Law class audience profiles:

Test dates and starting page
The test took place between 5-21 July 2016. Below is a screenshot of the Commission homepage at the time of testing.

This was the first round of tests done on the homepage design with the two tabs: “Commission and its priorities” and “Policies, information and services”.

---

The European Commission is the executive of the European Union and promotes its general interest.

President Juncker
The Commissioners.

Departments: Directorate-General and services
Commission at work.

Contact
EU local offices and information points
Press contacts
Commission staff
Contact unit by Commission activity.

Latest

Completing the reform of the Common European Asylum System

The Commission has completed its comprehensive review of the EU’s asylum procedure. It has proposed a common EU Asylum System, to meet the challenge of migration and ensure a fair and efficient asylum procedure.

Emerging Opportunities

Alibaba Cloud, the cloud computing arm of Chinese giant Alibaba, has set up a new business unit in Brussels to tap into the European cloud computing market.

Featured

Managing the refugee crisis
COP21 - United for climate
Completing Europe’s Economic and Monetary Union
II. Detailed results and charts

A. Overall results for the class

Performance (success, failure, task completion time)

The analysis shows that two participants out of three are failing when they try to complete top law tasks. In the longer term, we are aiming for a 100% success rate.
## Overview of test instructions and results

Test instructions were validated on 23 June 2016 by DGs OLAF, COMP, HOME, JUST, GROW, SANTE and SG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Success overall</th>
<th>Average success time</th>
<th>Discussion/review needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Find the English PDF version of the EU rules on the application of the EU Ecolabel.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>02:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Find the current EU law governing investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>02:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Find the page listing all the current EU legislation on cosmetics.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>01:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The European Commission has proposed legislation to allow people living in one EU country to more easily access online content produced in another. Find the page showing the status of the proposal in the law making process.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>According to the Commission plan, when will the review of the Satellite and Cable Directive be adopted by the EU institutions?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>01:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Find the title of the Maltese law implementing the EU asylum directive 2013/32/EU.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>01:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Commission is consulting the public as part of its evaluation of the current EU consumer and marketing law. Find the closing date of the public consultation.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>01:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>For how many weeks can the public give feedback on legislative proposals once they are adopted by the Commission?</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>02:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>When did the European Commission publish the latest documents on the Starbucks case?</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>00:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Check which country does not recognise divorce judgments made elsewhere in the EU.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>02:09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall findings: reusability of test instructions

Framing the task instructions correctly is essential to the success of the measurement process. Real tests may show that the test instructions do not work as intended, in which case a review is required before retesting.

The following overview shows which instructions worked as intended and are therefore suitable for retesting, and which must be discussed/reviewed with stakeholders before retesting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Discussion/review needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Find the English PDF version of the EU rules on the application of the EU Ecolabel.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Find the current EU law governing investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office.</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Find the page listing all the current EU legislation on cosmetics.</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The European Commission has proposed legislation to allow people living in one EU country to more easily access online content produced in another. Find the page showing the status of the proposal in the law making process.</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. According to the Commission plan, when will the review of the Satellite and Cable Directive be adopted by the EU institutions?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Find the title of the Maltese law implementing the EU asylum directive 2013/32/EU.</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Commission is consulting the public as part of its evaluation of the current EU consumer and marketing law. Find the closing date of the public consultation.</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For how many weeks can the public give feedback on legislative proposals once they are adopted by the Commission?</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When did the European Commission publish the latest documents on the Starbucks case?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Check which country does not recognise divorce judgments made elsewhere in the EU.</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall findings: class performance

1. People struggle with the Commission homepage as it offers no clear onward paths to the top task of the European Commission (EU law, rules, treaties, judgments).

2. The political priorities (first set of links visible on the homepage) are often assumed to be the main navigation. However they rarely offer onward paths to solve the tasks being tested. Navigation is therefore often abandoned in favour of search.

3. EC search returns poor results for the following reasons:
   - titles appearing in search results are poor – using numbers, jargon and starting with general instead of specific information
   - titles are often too broad and vague
   - no autocorrect. Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language.
   - many titles appear to be exact duplicates, but may link to different pages
   - the search box is too small to see the full search string and correct any spelling mistakes
   - results are clogged with press releases, blog posts, irrelevant or old content, and events
   - no landing/overview/summary pages for top tasks appear in results

4. Google search returns better results but the absence of landing/summary pages still made solving tasks difficult.

5. EUR-Lex and other DG destination pages caused problems for people solving tasks, or slowed task completion times, due to:
   - confusing menus and links
   - confusing internal search functionality
   - blocks of text not broken up with subheadings, bullets, etc., making them difficult to scan
   - onward links to solve tasks often hidden in blocks of text making them difficult to spot
   - people have to adapt to many different page layouts, with different designs for navigation and search, requiring more effort
B. Results by task instruction

**Instruction 1:** Find the English PDF version of the EU rules on the application of the EU Ecolabel.

1.1. Task reference

- Top task 1 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (EU law, rules, treaties, judgments)

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can find legislative documents (law, rules, directives, decisions)

1.2. Correct answer and target page


Answer: this page
1.3. **Performance**

*Instruction 1: Find the English PDF version of the EU rules on the application of the EU Ecolabel.*
**1.4. Findings: test instruction**

This instruction was intended to test how easily people can find a legislative document (the text of a law). The validated answer page was the EN pdf version of Regulation (EC) No 66/2010 on the EU Ecolabel.

1. Several participants asked for additional clarity on the instruction, mainly about the words “rules” and “application”:
   - "can I clarify? By application in the question do you mean literally applying it?” [...] "so, sticking it on...?"
   - "When you mention rules, do you mean legislation, because here the browser gives me guidelines, [indicating Google results page] but not the actual legislation..."
   - "Rules... rules ..." [...] I don't know if it's the rules...Is it meant...sorry that I'm asking...is it meant download leaflet?"
   - "I find it a tricky question, is it meant...it's with the rules, yes?"

2. During their task journey, several people came across onward paths to the Regulation itself but chose not to follow those paths.

3. The word ‘application’ was understood in the following ways
   - ‘Application’ of the rules on the label throughout the EU (*using the rules in practice: the intended interpretation*)
   - ‘Application’ of the label by an individual/business on a product (*sticking it on*)
   - ‘Application’ for permission to apply/use the label (*become an Ecolabel user*)

4. Nine people gave an answer to the instruction that was not in line with the validated answer. The answers were:
   - EU Ecolabel Logo guidelines (3 participants)
   - Application Pack – Part 1: Guidance notes' (pdf on how to apply for the ecolabel for a company’s product
   - EU Ecolabel User Manual
   - DG ENV pdf “The European Ecolabel”
   - Green Public Procurement Training Toolkit pdf
   - Compliance criteria on environmental claims (“Consumers” website)
   - DG ENV pdf "Ecolabel suits you"

The in-house understanding of the words ‘rules’ and ‘application’ in the validated instruction does not match the participants’ understanding of those words. Given that the intention is to test how easily people can find a legislative document, the instruction should be reviewed before re-testing.

**1.5. Findings: task performance**

The performance test for this task was negatively impacted by the instruction text.
Instruction 2: Find the current EU law governing investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office.

2.1. Task reference

- Top task 1 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (EU law, rules, treaties, judgments)
- Tiny task 56 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (Crime, fraud, corruption, human trafficking)

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can find legislative documents (law, rules, directives, decisions)

2.2. Correct answer and target page


Answer = Regulation (EU, EURATOM) No 883/2013
2.3. **Performance**

*Instruction 2: Find the current EU law governing investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office.*
2.4. **Findings: test instruction**

The instruction worked as intended and is therefore suitable for retesting.

2.5. **Findings: task performance**

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage
- EC search and Google return mixed results due to unclear, jargon-based and duplicate titles
- Information on the ‘European Anti-Fraud Office’ appears in multiple places. Different pages with the same title ‘European Anti-Fraud Office’ appeared high in search results but offered no clear onward paths towards the answer
- Three different pages on the topic ‘Fraud prevention’ appeared simultaneously in search results, leading to task failure. Some people landed on all three pages
- DG OLAF website: confusing menus, links and page structure lead to task failure.

1. **People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.** ‘EU law, rules, treaties, judgments’ is the European Commission’s top task number 1. Four people assumed the political priorities to be the main task navigation. Two others toured the homepage and then resorted to EC search.

Three people clicked on ‘Justice and Fundamental Rights’ and one person on ‘Internal Market’. They were unable to find an onward path to solve the task and resorted to EC search.
Finding no onward path to solve the task from these political priority pages, these people resorted to EC search. They searched for ‘European anti-fraud legislation’, ‘anti-fraud office’ and ‘anti fraud law’.
2. **EC search and Google return mixed results.** Pages on the ‘European Anti-Fraud Office’ and the topic ‘Fraud prevention’ appeared in top search results with identical titles. Paths to the answer on these pages were either non-existent or disregarded. EC search did not return pages from EUR-Lex in top search results, but Google did.
These two EUR-Lex pages appeared high in Google search results. Several people clicked on these links but were unable to find an onward path to the answer.

EUR-Lex results appear with unclear, jargon-based titles mentioning document numbers.
3. Information on the ‘European Anti-Fraud Office’ appears in multiple places. Different pages with the same title ‘European Anti-Fraud Office’ appeared high in search results but offered no clear onward paths towards the answer.

Five people landed on this page, which provides no links to the answer. To solve the task from here, participants must go to the OLAF website. Most people explored the page, went back to search and tried a different search term or ran out of time searching for a useful link.

This heading implies that this is the website of the European Anti-Fraud Office. To get to the actual OLAF website, people must click the link below the heading. Confusingly, the link is also labelled European Anti-Fraud Office.

These are in-page navigation labels. However, several people first scrolled the page and then spent time clicking on different labels in the left hand navigation.
Five people landed on this EUR-Lex page about decision 1999/352. Nobody clicked on either of these two links that led to the answer.
4. Three different pages on the topic ‘Fraud prevention’ appeared simultaneously in search results, leading to task failure. Some people landed on all three pages.

Two people landed here and clicked on ‘Law’, which led to a EUR-Lex page entitled ‘Fight against fraud’.

One person landing here said: “I think in this page I could find all the current law governing the anti-fraud activities”. None of the three people landing here were able to solve the task.
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Three people landed on this EUROPA page on ‘Fraud prevention’ with very long and dense blocks of text. Commission top tasks such as ‘EU law’ can only be found by scrolling to the bottom of the page. Only one person scrolled all the way down and clicked on ‘summaries of EU legislation’. The other two people scrolled down, but not all the way to the bottom, and then resorted to Europa search from this page.

One person searched for ‘OLAF regulation law’ from this page.
5. **DG OLAF website: confusing menus, links and page structure lead to task failure.**

Eight people landed on various pages on the OLAF website. The correct answer was mentioned on different pages but was often disregarded. Several people explored the horizontal navigation, but it offers no clear onward path to the top task of the European Commission ‘EU law, rules, treaties, judgments’. This led to task failure.
This person disregarded the link to the correct answer on this ‘FAQ’ page in the section ‘About us’, and clicked on ‘EUR-Lex Access to EU law’.

This person landed on a page in the section ‘Investigations’, hovered over a link at the bottom of the page that would lead to the correct answer, but then resorted to Google by entering the search string ‘EU law on olaf investigation’ from this page.

The answer is here.
Two people arrived on this page about the OLAF Regulation.

As the reference to the Regulation at the top of the memo is not clickable, one person copied the reference number and pasted it into Google. She didn’t notice that the footnote number was also copied, leading to task failure.

The other person scrolled to the bottom of the page and found the answer.
Instruction 3: Find the page listing all the current EU legislation on cosmetics

3.1. Task reference

- Top task 1 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (EU law, rules, treaties, judgments)

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can find an overview of legislation on a specific subject.

3.2. Correct answer and target page


Answer= the page
3.3. Performance

Instruction 3: Find the page listing all the current EU legislation on cosmetics.
3.4. **Findings: test instruction**

The instruction worked as intended and is therefore suitable for retesting.

3.5. **Findings: task performance**

This task performed very well. However, certain factors either caused task failure or slowed down task completion times:

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.
- EC search returns mixed results due to unclear, jargon-based and duplicate titles.
- People looked for cosmetics-related content under ‘Health’ but were unsuccessful.
- DG GROW sector page on ‘Cosmetics’: hard to scan.
- DG GROW page on cosmetics legislation: hard to scan.

1. **People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.**

![Image showing Commission homepage and internal market section](image-url)

One person clicked on the political priority ‘Internal Market’ and tried for more than 30 seconds to find an onward path to solve the task.

A second person clicked on ‘Departments (Directorates-General) and services’ but was unable to find an onward path to solve the task. The person then resorted to Google.
Arriving on this political priority page, this person spent over 30 seconds looking for an onward path, then resorted to EC search and in the end was able to complete the task.
2. EC search returns mixed results

The answer page often appeared in top search results (both EC search and Google), but the title of the page is broad and vague.

Three people disregarded the answer page in their search results and clicked elsewhere which in one case led to task failure.

The top result leads to the answer but exactly the same title appeared in search results for legislation on different topics.
Old content appears at the top of search results.

Titles lead from the general and should lead from the specific.

Duplicate titles, which are broad and vague.

Not very helpful search results for this very logical search string. Transparency Register pages consistently appeared high in search results.

The answer page does not appear in search results for this very logical search string.
3. People looked for cosmetics-related content under ‘Health’ but were unsuccessful

Arriving here from the ‘Departments and services’ link on the Commission homepage, this person said “Cosmetics should be in health...” and clicked on ‘Health and Food Safety (SANTE)’.

Arriving on the Public Health section from the DG SANTE homepage, she said: “No...should be here...but it’s not so I will go back to Google again.

This person searched for ‘Legislation’ and filtered by ‘Health, Wellbeing & Consumer Protection’, assuming that this would return cosmetics-related content, but it did not.
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4. **DG GROW sector page on ‘Cosmetics’: hard to scan.** The purpose and context of this page are not immediately clear (sector landing page?, topics summary page?). The title is very broad and is duplicated left and centre. What is the relationship between the top navigation, left navigation and body text? (no elements are highlighted).

![DG GROW sector page on ‘Cosmetics’: hard to scan.](image)

Five people landed here through search and looked for onward paths. They all disregarded the link ‘Legislation’ in the left hand navigation, which led to the answer.

- Most continued their journey by clicking on the link ‘legislation’ in the text below the scroll, which led to the answer.
- One person wrongly gave this page as the answer.
5. DG GROW page on cosmetics legislation (answer page): hard to scan.

Four people who landed here did not immediately recognise it as the answer page, which slowed down task completion times.

- Three people clicked on ‘Regulation (EC)…’ which led to EUR-Lex.
- One person spent a full minute touring the page before giving it as the answer.

The page is long and hard to scan – people had to scroll down to discover the content of the page.

A page of this length would benefit from a brief overview at the top.

The page heading is broad and vague. What is the difference between ‘legislation’, ‘main legislation’, and ‘Regulation’?

What is the added value of the subtitle ‘main legislation’? Why not just ‘Cosmetics Regulation’ as mentioned further down the page?
Instruction 4: The European Commission has proposed legislation to allow people living in one EU country to more easily access online content produced in another. Find the page showing the status of the proposal in the law making process.

4.1. Task reference

- Medium task 13 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (Track policy and law making process, updates)

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can track the status of a legislative proposal

4.2. Correct answer and target page


Answer= the page
4.3. **Performance**

**Instruction 4:** The European Commission has proposed legislation to allow people living in one EU country to more easily access online content produced in another. Find the page showing the status of the proposal in the law making process.
4.4. **Findings: test instruction**

The instruction worked as intended and is therefore suitable for retesting.

4.5. **Findings: task performance**

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage
- EC search returns poor results due to
  - no landing/overview/summary pages on ‘Law’ appearing in results
  - EUR-Lex not appearing in top search results
  - unclear, jargon-based titles
  - missing autocorrect
  - duplicate titles linking to different pages
  - results clogged with press releases with titles leading from the general instead of the specific
- DG Connect page ‘Digital Single Market strategy - Access’: no obvious onward path to solve the task
- Google returns mixed results. Top results include EUR-Lex but also press releases with no onward paths to the answer.
- Press releases and factsheets in the ‘Rapid’ database appear high in search results yet offer no onward paths to the answer, leading to task failure
- EUR-Lex: confusing advanced search leads to task failure.

1. **People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.**
This person hovered over several political priorities without clicking, and then searched for ‘legislation’ on the Commission homepage.

This person searched for ‘law’ on the Commission homepage.

People landing on this political priority page all clicked on the link ‘Better online access to digital goods and services’, but found no onward links to solve the task.
2. **EC search returns poor results.**

The search box is too small to see the entire search string and correct any spelling mistakes. Typos even led to people giving up the attempt to solve this task.

No autocorrect. Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language. Two people entered ‘legistation’ instead of ‘legislation’.
The search string ‘law proposal status’ returns no results from EUR-Lex or a landing/summary/overview page on ‘Law’ (the Commission’s top task no. 1)

Results are clogged with press releases from 2008, 2009 and 2011. The titles lead from the general, and should lead from the specific.

Several people clicked on press releases and factsheets. Although some were on the correct topic, they provided no onward path to the answer.
The search string ‘law status online content’ returns no results from EUR-Lex or a landing/summary/overview page on ‘Law’.

All seven visible results are from the section ‘.../info/law/better-regulation/...’.
3. DG Connect page ‘Digital Single Market strategy - Access’: no obvious onward path to solve the task.

Several people landed on this page. They clicked on various links but were unable to find an onward path to track the status of a legislative proposal.
4. **Google returns mixed results.** Search strings containing the words ‘law’ or ‘legislation’ return results from EUR-Lex. Google also suggests corrections for typos.

This person wrote ‘legisation’ and Google suggested ‘legislation’.

The search string ‘EU online law status’ returns a link to the EUR-Lex homepage as the top result. The second result also gives access to the EUR-Lex homepage.

Press releases dominate these search results. The first one relates to the correct subject but provides no onward path to solve the task.
5. **Press releases and factsheets in the ‘Rapid’ database appear high in search results yet offer no onward paths to the answer, leading to task failure.**

The top three search results for this search string were Commission press releases. Several people clicked on different press releases and factsheets.
Three people landed on this particular press release from 9 December 2015, which appeared high in search results. The text is very long and dense. It explains the context of the legislative proposal, but offers no onward link to track the status of the proposal in the law-making process. People clicked on various links (outlined in red).

Two people gave this press release as the answer to the task.
6. EUR-Lex: confusing advanced search leads to task failure.

This person searched for ‘access to online content’ in the collection ‘Legislative procedures’ but got no results.
This person made four search attempts with different search strings but got no useful results.

In the third search attempt, the person entered the two previous search strings in separate boxes. However the ‘OR’ condition meant that the search would not look for both strings combined.

To combine two search strings, they must both be entered in the top box. The advanced search hints are in small text on the right and were not noticed.

In the fourth search attempt, the person changed the second search string into ‘online content international’ but the search results would still be for either the first search string OR the second.
Instruction 5: According to the Commission plan, when will the review of the Satellite and Cable Directive be adopted by the EU institutions?

5.1. Task reference

- Medium task 13 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (Track policy and law making process, updates)

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can track the timing of upcoming legislation

5.2. Correct answer and target page


Answer= page 10/107: “2nd quarter 2016”
5.3. **Performance**

*Instruction 5:* According to the Commission plan, when will the review of the Satellite and Cable Directive be adopted by the EU institutions?
5.4. **Findings: test instruction**

This instruction was intended to test ‘track the timing of upcoming legislation’. To answer correctly, it was essential for them to find the Commission Work Programme. Some people found answers that were not as precise as the date given in the Commission Work Programme and were therefore considered as a failure. **The instruction text and correct answer must be reviewed before retesting.**

5.5. **Findings: task performance**

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage
- Political priority page ‘Digital Single Market’: no onward path to solve the task
- EC search returns poor results due to:
  - unclear, jargon-based titles
  - titles leading from the general instead of the specific
  - missing autocorrect
  - results clogged with press releases and old content
- The EU single Market ‘Satellite and Cable’ page: no onward paths to solve the task
- EUR-Lex page on current satellite and cable directive (93/83/EEC): no onward path to track the timing of upcoming legislation
- Digital Single Market website, Society section: three pages dealing with different aspects of the review slowed down task completion times as they offered no onward links to solve the task
  - Page 1: Satellite and Cable Directive page
  - Page 2: ‘EU seeks views on the Satellite and Cable Directive’
  - Page 3: ‘Full report on the public consultation on the review of the EU Satellite and Cable Directive’
- PDF from the Better Regulation Portal called ‘Evaluation and fitness check (FC) roadmap’: jargon on page caused confusion
1. People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.

Two people clicked on ‘Digital Single Market’, but the pages on this political priority offer no onward path to solve the task.

Although ‘EU law, rules, treaties, judgments’ is top task number 1 for the European Commission, there is no clear link to it from the Commission homepage. Nine people resorted to EC search from the Commission homepage. All but one search string included the word ‘Directive’.
2. Political priority page ‘Digital Single Market’: no onward path to solve the task.

Four people landed on this political priority page. They all scrolled down, looking for an onward path, and then left.
3. EC search returns poor results.

This person typed ‘satelliet’ instead of ‘satellite’ and got only one result, in Dutch.

No autocorrect. Two people failed to complete this task as a direct result of poor search results due to typos. Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language.

No autocorrect. Two people failed to complete this task as a direct result of poor search results due to typos. Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language.

This person typed ‘sattelite’ instead of ‘satellite’ and got very poor search results. All the titles are jargon-based.

Titles lead from the general, and should lead from the specific.

Very outdated result.
4. The EU single Market ‘Satellite and Cable’ page: no onward paths to solve the task

Three people arrived on this page via Google. The page provides information on the satellite and cable Directive dating from 1993, but not on upcoming legislation (the review of the Directive). They all spent time clicking on various links on this page.

The titles of all these search results (for a very logical search string) lead from the general (Europa/Competition/) and should lead from the specific.

Why are all these results from 1995 and 1996?
5. **EUR-Lex page on current satellite and cable directive (93/83/EEC):** no onward path to track the timing of upcoming legislation

Five people landed on this EUR-Lex page on the Directive, either through navigation or through search. The page provided no onward path to the answer.

6. **Digital Single Market website, Society section:** three pages dealing with different aspects of the review slowed down task completion times as they offered no onward links to solve the task.

These three pages from the Digital Single Market website appeared high in search results and were clicked on by several people.
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Eight people landed on this page via Google and EC search. Four of them clicked the tab ‘Latest’ but could not find the latest information on the review.


Two people arrived on this page which describes the review, explains why and how it is being carried out, but does not say when it will be adopted.

Three people arrived on this page about the public consultation on the review, but found no links to track the next steps in the review process.

7. PDF from the Better Regulation Portal called ‘Evaluation and fitness check Roadmap’: jargon on page caused confusion. Two people provided wrong answers from this page which described the steps in the process of the evaluation/review of the Satellite and Cable Directive. (URL: http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/roadmaps/docs/2015_cnect_019_cwp_evaluation_sat_cab_en.pdf)

This PDF mentions a planned completion date, but not an adoption date. What is the difference between 'completion' and 'adoption', and between 'evaluation' and 'review'??
Instruction 6: Find the title of the Maltese law implementing the EU asylum directive 2013/32/EU

6.1. Task reference

- Small task 22 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (National implementation of EU law, infringements)

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can find the text of a national law implementing an EU directive.

6.2. Correct answer and target page


Answer= "Procedural Standards for Granting and Withdrawing International Protection Regulations, 2015 (Refugees Act, Chapter 420 of the Laws of Malta)"

![Image of the source code and the search result for the Maltese law implementing the EU asylum directive 2013/32/EU]
6.3. **Performance**

*Instruction 6: Find the title of the Maltese law implementing the EU asylum directive 2013/32/EU*
6.4. **Findings: test instruction**

Only one person succeeded. This person asked “is it the national Maltese?”. Adding the word ‘national’ to the instruction may clarify the intention.

6.5. **Findings: task performance**

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage. The search box on the homepage is too small.
- EC search returns poor results due to:
  - EUR-Lex not appearing in top search results
  - unclear, jargon-based titles
  - duplicate titles linking to different pages
  - titles leading from the general instead of the specific
- DG HOME page on infringements by policy (under ‘EU law monitoring’) offers no onward paths to solve the task
- Press release in Rapid on ‘Implementing the Common European Asylum System’ offers no clear route to ‘national implementation’
- Directive 2013/32/EU in EUR-Lex: confusing menus and links
- DG HOME homepage offers no clear onward paths to find the answer: two people clicked on ‘Common European Asylum System’ but found no logical onward paths to the answer.

1. People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.

   ![Image](image.png)

   The search box is too small to see the full search string and correct any spelling mistakes.
People clicked on these different labels/links, assuming they would offer an onward path to solve the task. These people later resorted to EC search.

Two people clicked on the tab ‘Policies, information and services’.
2. EC search returns poor results.

Many people entered the actual directive number in EC search, but EUR-Lex did not appear in top search results.

All results lead to DG HOME pages on migration infringements for each Member State, with no onward paths to solve the task.

Duplicate titles, linking to different pages.

Titles lead from the general and should lead from the specific.
Results are clogged with pdf files using unclear, jargon-based titles

The title of the first result is too broad and vague. It leads to a page about human trafficking with the message ‘sorry, the content was not found’.

Result from 01 Jan 1980?
3. DG HOME page on infringements by policy (under ‘EU law monitoring’) offers no onward paths to solve the task.

‘Rejected query’ message for a logical search term with the use of the date filter. The text is very unfriendly, saying “Your search contains character string [...] could damage our system”. This page appeared very high in search results (both EC search and Google). Eleven people who failed to complete the task arrived here. Most people scrolled the list looking for results related to Malta. Some people went away or gave the wrong answer, others continued to the ‘Infringements decisions database’.
This person scrolled the long list of results, highlighted a result related to ‘Malta’, then went back to EC search.

One person arriving on this page (infringements for Malta) via EC search, scrolled down and looked at the results for more than 1 min 30 secs.
4. Press release in Rapid on ‘Implementing the Common European Asylum System’ offers no clear route to ‘national implementation’

Five people landed on this press release in the Rapid database (mainly via Google). Most of them read the press release carefully and left again. Two people clicked on a link in the text to Directive 2013/32/EU in EUR-LEX, but were unable to find an onward path to the answer.
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5. Directive 2013/32/EU in EUR-Lex: confusing menus and links. Several people arrived on the EUR-Lex website and were unable to complete the task.

Several people landed on the EUR-Lex page about Directive 2013/32/EU.

One person said: “I’m not sure if this Maltese law is published in the web page of the Commission. So I think, at this stage, I will stop. I would try to find a different solution. Maybe not find it in the European Commission web page.”

Seven people landed on the EUR-Lex page about Directive 2013/32/EU.

This person missed the correct onward path and instead searched for ‘asylum directive malta’ from the EUR-Lex page on Directive 2013/32/EU, but failed to complete the task.

Only one person clicked on the tab ‘National transposition’ and found the answer.

The word ‘transposition’ is not frequently used by users.
After having tried the standard search function in EUR-Lex, this person entered logical search terms in the ‘Advanced search’ option, leading to ‘No results found’.
6. DG HOME homepage offers no clear onward paths to find the answer.

People arriving on this page clicked on ‘E-Library’ and ‘Common European Asylum System’ but were unable to find any logical onward paths to solve the task.
**Instruction 7:** The Commission is consulting the public as part of its evaluation of the current EU consumer and marketing law. Find the closing date of the public consultation.

7.1. **Task reference**

- Tiny task 44 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (Initiate, contribute to law making (public consultations, citizen's initiative))

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can find a public consultation.

7.2. **Correct answer and target page**


Answer= 2 September 2016
7.3. **Performance**

*Instruction 7:* The Commission is consulting the public as part of its evaluation of the current EU consumer and marketing law. Find the closing date of the public consultation.
7.4. **Findings: test instruction**

The instruction worked as intended and is therefore suitable for retesting.

7.5. **Findings: task performance**

This task performed very well. Participants mainly used search (Google and EC search) to solve this task.

However, certain factors slowed task completion times:
- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage
- EC search returns mixed results due to:
  - unclear, jargon-based titles
  - missing autocorrect
  - duplicate titles linking to different pages
  - titles leading from the general instead of the specific
- Use of internal jargon. The title of the public consultation seems to have been unclear (perhaps due to the words ‘Fitness Check’?)
1. People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.

Several people scrolled up and down and then resorted to EC search having found no onward path.

Several others clicked on the labels/links outlined in red, assuming they would offer an onward path to solve the task. These people then also resorted to search.
2. **EC search returns mixed results.** Search worked rather well for this task. Logical terms which included the words ‘Consumer Marketing’ and ‘Consultation’ returned links to pages that contained the answer. However, certain factors slowed down task completion times such as poor or duplicate titles and the lack of an autocorrect functionality.
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No autocorrect. This person writes ‘consulation’ instead of ‘consultation’. Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language.

Titles lead from the general, and should lead from the specific.

Unclear, jargon-based result.

Result without a title.
The first result leads to a page from the Representation in Malta, which happens to mention the answer.

Duplicate titles.
This page from the Representation in Malta appeared high in search results. The page contains the answer, which enabled two people to complete the task.
3. **Internal jargon is an obstacle to task completion.** The title of the public consultation seems to have been unclear (perhaps due to the words “Fitness Check”?)

Although the first link leads to the answer, this person clicked on ‘More’ in the second result and provided the wrong answer.
This person scrolled down the list of public consultations in the area of ‘Consumer policy’ (the first result led to the correct answer), and then resorted to search, searching for ‘marketing’.
Two people chose not to click the first result (leading directly to the answer) and instead clicked on the third result.
Instruction 8: For how many weeks can the public give feedback on legislative proposals once they are adopted by the Commission?

8.1. Task reference

- Medium task 13 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (Track policy and law making process, updates)

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can find information on the process of law-making.

8.2. Correct answer and target page

https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/contribute-law-making_en

Answer= “8 weeks following publication of the Commission proposal in all EU languages”
8.3. Performance

Instruction 8: For how many weeks can the public give feedback on legislative proposals once they are adopted by the Commission?
8.4. **Findings: test instruction**

The instruction worked as intended and is therefore suitable for retesting.

8.5. **Findings: task performance**

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage
- Subject-matter dealt with on multiple pages. Duplicate content has not been removed
- EC search returns poor results due to:
  - unclear, jargon-based titles
  - duplicate titles linking to different pages
  - titles leading from the general instead of the specific
  - missing autocorrect
- The page ‘How EU policy is made’ in the ‘About the EU’ class slowed down task completion times
- A EUROPA page appeared high in search results. This page directed people to the ‘Your Voice in Europe’ website but the onward path to solve this task (behind a tab in the top menu) was not clear.
1. People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.

Several people scrolled up and down, looking for an onward path to solve the task. One person said: “OK…so where do I start from…?” Four people clicked on the tab “Policies, information and services”.

Two people clicked on ‘Internal Market’ and ‘Justice and Fundamental Rights’ but the pages on these political priorities have no onward links to solve the task.

One person toured the homepage, clicked on ‘Commission at work’ and failed to complete the task.
2. **Subject-matter dealt with on multiple pages.** Duplicate content has not been removed. Each page has a different title, structure, look and feel. Some of these pages appeared simultaneously in search results. The five answer pages were:

- ‘Contribute to Law-making’ page in the ‘Law’ class (validated answer page)
- ‘How EU policy is made’ page in the ‘About the EU’ class
- DG EMPL page ‘Feedback on adopted proposals’
- Your Voice in Europe “Give your feedback!” page
- DG DEVCO page ‘Your Feedback’
3. EC search returns poor results

- The search box is too small to see the entire search string.
- No autocorrect. The person entered ‘feedback’ instead of ‘feedback’. Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language.
- Title leads from the general, and should lead from the specific.
- Duplicate titles, linking to different pages.
- Titles too broad and vague. Public initiatives in relation to what? Consultations in relation to what?
- What is the logic deciding which keywords are highlighted and which result appears first? The first result contains no words from the search string, and the word ‘Publications’ is highlighted.
One person tried to improve his search result by using the filter. He said: "The filter is very restrictive [...] there’s only filters by sector."

What is the logic behind the list of filter options?

- Poor titles.
- Unclear, jargon-based results using abbreviations.
4. The page ‘How EU policy is made’ in the ‘About the EU’ class slowed down task completion times.

This page contains the answer but it was overlooked by two out of three people landing here.
5. The EUROPA page ‘How EU decisions are made’ appeared high in search results. This page linked to the homepage of the ‘Your Voice in Europe’ website, but the onward path to solve this task (behind a tab in the top menu) was not clear, which slowed task completion times.

Two people clicked on ‘Public consultations’ as the text promised more information about the consultation procedure. But the link leads to a page listing all open consultations.
Consultations

Climate Action:
Consultation on monitoring and reporting of fuel consumption and CO2 emissions from Heavy Duty Vehicles

Climate Action:

Energy:
Establishment of the annual priority lists for the development of network codes and guidelines for 2017 and beyond

Youth, Sport:
Evaluation of the Youth policy cooperation in the EU - public consultation

Home Affairs:
Public Consultation on the actions under the programme "Prevention, Preparedness and Consequence Management of Terrorism and other Security related risks" (CIPS) for 2007 – 2013

Home Affairs:
Public Consultation on the actions under the programme "Prevention of and Fight against Crime" (ISEC) for 2007-2013
Instruction 9: When did the European Commission publish the latest documents on the Starbucks case?

9.1. Task reference

- Tiny task 38 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (Competition (state aid, cartels, mergers, anti-trust))

The instruction is intended to test how easily people can find information on case law (ECJ decisions, important cases)

9.2. Correct answer and target page


Answer= 27 June 2016
9.3. Performance

Instruction 9: When did the European Commission publish the latest documents on the Starbucks case?
9.4. **Findings: test instruction**

This instruction was intented to test the findability of information on case law. However the word ‘document’ may have led people to consider the press release as a valid answer. **The instruction must therefore be reviewed before retesting.**

9.5. **Findings: task performance**

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage
- EC search returns poor results due to:
  - unclear, jargon-based titles
  - missing autocorrect
  - results clogged with old content
- Google returns good results, but the organisation-centric title of the answer page was not recognized as helpful
- DG COMP page on the Starbucks case: confusing content and page structure
- The press release on selective tax advantages slows task completion time.
- Page ‘Starbucks Coffee Company’ in the Transparency register slows task completion times.

1. **People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage.**

   The political priorities are assumed to be the main navigation. Two people clicked on ‘EU-US Free Trade’ and ‘Economic and Monetary Union’ and then resorted to EC search as they found no onward paths to solve the task.
People searched for ‘Starbucks’ from the political website. The search box is too small to see the entire search string.
2. EC search returns poor results

Organisation-centric, jargon-based results using abbreviations/acronyms.

Unclear title.

Organisation-centric, jargon-based results using abbreviations/acronyms.

Unclear titles.
Poor results when someone is looking for ‘T-760/15’, the actual case number.

Jargon-based results using abbreviations/acronyms.

Old content appears in the search results.

No autocorrect. Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language. These people entered ‘commision’ and ‘comission’ instead of ‘commission’.
After selecting a search filter, a new button ‘Update Search’ appears. This person selects ‘File formats > web’ but does not notice the button. The results therefore stay unchanged.
3. Google returns good results, but the organisation-centric title of the answer page was not recognized as helpful.

Google returned the answer page for logical search terms. The answer page appeared in the top Google search results for eight people but was disregarded by three of them. The title of the page starts with an organisation-centric abbreviation that is not recognised as helpful.
4. **DG COMP page on the Starbucks case: confusing content and page structure.** Six people landed on the DG COMP page which contained the answer, but:

- only two people gave the correct answer.
- two people scrolled down and then left the page.
- one person provided the decision date as the correct answer. (incorrect)
- one person scrolled down and clicked on the link next to 'Related court case(s).

The title of the page is unclear, as is the context of a Commission court case. The page itself is hard to scan and the latest publishing date is hard to spot.

What do these labels mean?
5. Press release on selective tax advantages slows task completion time.

The press release about selective tax advantages appeared in top search results for most logical search terms. Six people inferred that this ‘document’ was the latest one released by the Commission and gave the date of the press release (21 October 2015) as the correct answer.
At the very bottom of the press release there is an onward link to the answer, but the page is very long and the text is very dense and small. Only one person went all the way to the bottom of the page.

Three people wasted time by going to this page in the Transparency Register, which appeared very high in search results. The page provides no onward links to solve the task.
Instruction 10: Check which country does not recognise divorce judgments made elsewhere in the EU.

10.1. Task reference
   - Tiny task 65 from ‘EC-wide’ poll 2014 (Judicial cooperation between EU countries, recognition of judgments)

10.2. Correct answer / target page

Answer= Denmark
10.3. Performance

Instruction 10: Check which country does not recognise divorce judgments made elsewhere in the EU.
10.4. **Findings: test instruction**

The instruction worked as intended and is therefore suitable for retesting.

10.5. **Findings: task performance**

- People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage. The search box on the Commission homepage is too small.
- EC search returns poor results
  - no landing/overview/summary pages on ‘Law’ appearing in results
  - duplicate titles linking to different pages
  - unclear, jargon-based titles
  - results clogged with old and obsolete content
- Google returns helpful results
- DG JUST E-Justice Portal: duplicate titles and incomplete information slowed down task completion times.
- Your Europe FAQs page on ‘Divorce and legal separation’: misleading information leading to task failure
- EUR-Lex HTML version of Council Regulation 2201/2003: page contains the answer but dense blocks of text without subheadings, bullets, etc. makes it difficult to scan.

1. **People found no onward path to solve this task from the Commission homepage. The search box on the Commission homepage is too small.**

   ![Image of Commission homepage](image.png)

   Three people clicked on the political priority ‘Justice and Fundamental Rights’, then resorted to EC search.
People landing on the political priority ‘Justice and Fundamental Rights’ all resorted to search to try to solve the task.

The search box is too small to see the full search string ‘Divorce judgment not recognised’. This makes it hard to correct any spelling mistakes.
2. EC search returns poor results.

**No autocorrect.** Autocorrect is particularly important for people who are not searching in their native language. This person typed ‘Divorse’ instead of ‘Divorce’. The suggested correction was "diverse". This person also typed ‘Divorse’ instead of ‘Divorce’. There was no suggested correction, and the single search result is unhelpful.

Duplicate and near-duplicate titles, all leading from the general instead of the specific.
3. Google returns helpful results.

Five out of eight people who succeeded in finding the answer used Google.

This person searched for ‘EU divorce judgement not recognized’ in Google. The first search result was the correct answer page. The person clicked that result and completed the task in 41 seconds.

Old and obsolete pages (2004, 2007) from the ‘European Judicial Network’ website appeared in top EC search results. The disclaimer on the pages reads “The page is now obsolete. The update is currently being prepared and will be available in the European e-Justice Portal.”
4. DG JUST E-Justice Portal: duplicate titles and incomplete information slowed down task completion times.

The E-Justice Portal ‘Family Matters […] Divorce’ landing page did not appear in search results, but pages on specific countries appeared very high. Participants clicked on pages for Slovenia, Finland, Luxembourg, Spain and Estonia. Some pages contained the answer, others did not.

All country-specific pages in the e-Justice Portal on ‘Divorce’ have the same table of contents, but do not provide an easy onward path to EU-level information.

In an attempt to find the answer, several people clicked on question 14 which reads "What should I do to have a decision on divorce/legal separation/marriage annulment issued by a court in another Member State recognised in this Member State?"
5. Your Europe FAQs page on ‘Divorce and legal separation’: misleading information leading to task failure.

A YourEurope FAQ page on ‘Divorce and legal separation’ appeared in the top three EC search results. Three people clicked here. The main YourEurope page on the topic did not appear.

Two people gave the wrong answer from the page. The answer to question three reads “A divorce [...] granted in any EU country [...] will automatically be recognised in any other [...], without any special procedure.”

- One person concluded: “So I guess, no country – every country recognises it.”
- The other person said: "I found that all divorce judgements are recognised throughout the EU, wherever they are made, by everybody. So I’m a bit stuck to find which one doesn't."
6. **EUR-Lex HTML version of Council Regulation 2201/2003**: page contains the answer but dense blocks of text without subheadings, bullets, etc. makes it difficult to scan.

This screenshot of the Regulation shows just one third of the HTML text. The answer was here but not spotted. One person spent over 1 minute scrolling this page and then resorted to Google.
### Annex 1: EC-wide top task poll results, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU law, rules, treaties, judgments</td>
<td>83931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and innovation</td>
<td>83306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding, grants, subsidies</td>
<td>79414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training in EU</td>
<td>59623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU strategy, political priorities</td>
<td>45331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>44921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs, traineeships at the European Commission</td>
<td>40358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a job in another EU country</td>
<td>37657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU news, announcements, press releases</td>
<td>36809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights, fundamental rights</td>
<td>35274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in an EU country (rights, permits, benefits)</td>
<td>34986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order, download an EU publication</td>
<td>33794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track policy and law making process, updates</td>
<td>33558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics and forecasts</td>
<td>32983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the European Union (role, structure, how it works, origin)</td>
<td>30065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and farming (production and safety)</td>
<td>27703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change, global warming</td>
<td>26932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional, rural and urban development</td>
<td>25764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of information (transparency, access to documents)</td>
<td>25157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the European Commission (role, structure, how it works)</td>
<td>24866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product safety, conformity, certification</td>
<td>24660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National implementation of EU law, infringements</td>
<td>24326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health, disease prevention</td>
<td>23933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture (heritage, arts, films, Capitals of Culture)</td>
<td>23907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing business in the EU</td>
<td>23650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth, financial stability in EU (crisis, assistance to member states)</td>
<td>23215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing business with the European Commission (calls for tenders, bids)</td>
<td>23021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences, summits, meetings, events</td>
<td>22111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry norms and standards</td>
<td>21474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing people (recruitment, terms and conditions, redundancies)</td>
<td>21103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of educational, professional qualifications</td>
<td>20677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency</td>
<td>20226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel within, to and from EU (documents, visa, consular help, currencies)</td>
<td>19166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to another EU country (residence formalities)</td>
<td>17958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking and financial markets (reform, regulation)</td>
<td>17895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations with non-EU countries, international organisations (diplomacy, cooperation agreements)</td>
<td>17895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages in the EU (diversity, translation, interpreting)</td>
<td>17295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition (state aid, cartels, mergers, anti-trust)</td>
<td>16638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Development and humanitarian aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Healthcare in another EU country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Contact European Commission, European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Trade with non-EU countries (import, export, agreements, anti-dumping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Loans, access to finance, microfinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Initiate, contribute to law making (public consultations, citizen's initiative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Public procurement (contracts with public authorities, governments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Euro (coins, notes, eurozone, Economic and Monetary Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Intellectual property, copyright, trademarks, patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Customs, tariffs, quotas, duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Privacy, data protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Consumer and passenger rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>EU labels (eco labels, quality labels, audits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Immigration into the EU (asylum, reuniting family, integration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>EU budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>EU vocabulary and abbreviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Voting in the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Crime, fraud, corruption, human trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Security, defence (terrorism, sanctions, critical infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Chemicals (approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Volunteering opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Corporate social responsibility for business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>E-government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Taxation, excise (not VAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Accession of new countries to the EU, enlargement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>VAT (Value Added Tax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Judicial cooperation between EU countries, recognition of judgments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Pensions, retirement in another EU country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Transport safety (air, road, banned airlines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Complaints to the European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Resource security (oil, gas, raw materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Family (marriage, divorce, partnerships, adoption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Emergencies, disasters, civil protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Visit EU institutions, guided tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>European Commissioner profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Goods allowed when crossing borders (alcohol, cigarettes, cash, pets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Driving licence validity in EU countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Vehicles (buying, selling, registration, taxes, insurance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>President of the Commission (profile, agenda)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 Test user profiles

Recruiting participants for TPI testing

To establish an adequate picture of task performance, 15 answers are required for each instruction. To ensure this, 15-18 participants must be recruited for each testing round.

Participants are recruited from a pool of people who have participated in previous polls and surveys (thereby giving their profile information) and who have volunteered to participate in future testing by giving their email address.

Some or all of the following profile elements are known for each volunteer (depending on the poll/survey they took part in):

- Language preferences (first and 2\textsuperscript{nd} language choices)
- Country of residence
- Employment status (employed, self-employed, unemployed, student, retired)
- Workplace (private/public/NGO)
- Occupation (for example: Journalist, teacher, lawyer, etc.)\(^{11}\)
- Frequency of web visits
- Age
- Private or professional use
- Most important/relevant user tasks
- Interest areas (can be multiple)

All this data is held in a database.

TPI testing is done per class. This means that the recruitment pool consists of all volunteers who voted for one of the tasks included in the class. This pool is statistically analysed to identify the mix of profiles, focusing on the two elements 'occupation' and 'frequency of web visits'\(^{12}\). The percentage of each major occupation is assigned a proportionate number in relation to the total number sought (15-18 participants per testing round). The actual mix of test participants should be as close as possible to the representative mix thus identified.

On the basis of this representative mix, specific volunteers are identified\(^{13}\) and invited (by personalised email) to participate in the testing round. The actual tests are scheduled bilaterally through email exchange with each participant. If a participant fails to show up for

---

\(^{11}\) Depending on the survey, data on occupation varies.

\(^{12}\) For certain classes, analysis might show that another element is also important, e.g 'age' for the class 'education'.

\(^{13}\) At this stage, the list of participants is also checked to ensure a proportionate distribution of the aggregated profile elements 'EU/Non-EU' and 'workplace' (public/private/NGO)
the test or there are insurmountable technical difficulties, a replacement participant is found with the same profile.

Ideal mix of profiles & actual mix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>EC-wide 2014 poll results</th>
<th>Ideal mix of participants</th>
<th>Actual number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist, media professional</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer, legal professional</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbyist, interest representative</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy maker</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher, professor, researcher (academia)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-business</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of web visit</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private companies</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU / non-EU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Europe</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Stability of results

Stability of results
(average success rate for Law)