



The Community Digital Compass

Community Platform Solutions for People and Policy

Szkola, S., Williquet, F.

2025



Joint
Research
Centre

This document is a publication by the Joint Research Centre (JRC), the European Commission's science and knowledge service. It aims to provide evidence-based scientific support to the European policymaking process. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or opinion of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use that might be made of this publication. For information on the methodology and quality underlying the data used in this publication for which the source is neither Eurostat nor other Commission services, users should contact the referenced source. The designations employed and the presentation of material on the maps do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the European Union concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

EU Science Hub
<https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu>

JRC141251

PDF ISBN 978-92-68-25688-6 doi:10.2760/7062939 KJ-01-25-185-EN-N

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2025

© European Union, 2025



The reuse policy of the European Commission documents is implemented by the Commission Decision 2011/833/EU of 12 December 2011 on the reuse of Commission documents (OJ L 330, 14.12.2011, p. 39). Unless otherwise noted, the reuse of this document is authorised under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). This means that reuse is allowed provided appropriate credit is given and any changes are indicated.

For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not owned by the European Union permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

How to cite this report: European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Szkola, S. and Williquet, F., The Community Digital Compass, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2025, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/7062939>, JRC141251.

Contents

- Abstract 2
- Acknowledgements..... 3
- 1 Introduction 4
- 2 The community digital compass – a community platforms exploration tool..... 7
 - 2.1 Contextualising digital community governance 7
 - 2.2 Contextualising the community to choose a digital platform..... 8
 - 2.3 Exploring community platform options..... 11
 - 2.3.1 Access..... 12
 - 2.3.2 Platform ambitions..... 12
 - 2.3.3 Engagement..... 13
 - 2.3.4 User experience 14
 - 2.3.5 Integrations..... 15
 - 2.3.6 Security and privacy..... 15
 - 2.3.7 Budget..... 16
 - 2.4 Exploration exercises: process suggestions on how to select your community platform..... 17
 - 2.4.1 As checklist..... 17
 - 2.4.2 As workshop and conversation te(a)mplate 18
 - 2.4.3 As prioritisation ranking exercise..... 19
 - 2.5 A minimum viable community platform..... 21
- 3 Conclusions..... 22
- References 24
- List of abbreviations and definitions 27
- List of boxes..... 28
- List of figures..... 29
- List of tables..... 30
- Annexes 31

Abstract

Communities play a critical role in bridging the gap between policy and people, and knowledge and action. Yet digital community platforms often fail to meet real-world needs. This digital compass for communities identifies four challenges - fragmented platform ecosystems, trustworthy human interaction, digital skills gaps, and over-engineered tools - and offers guidance to offer human-centred public digital community services.

The compass – an exploration tool for digital community platforms - includes 39 platform selection questions and game cards in the areas of *access, platform ambitions, engagement, user experience, integrations, security and privacy, and budget*, as well as scoping tools and checklists designed to help policymakers and community leaders select the right digital solutions. These materials enable decision-makers to understand and explore both the social and technical dimensions of platform design, align policy and IT perspectives, and define community management functions through detailed feature exploration.

Note: This publication is the third one in a communities series (also including the ‘communities of practice checklist’ and ‘the communities of practice barometer’, cf. European Commission 2024e,f) concluding the add-ons to the Communities of Practice Playbook (European Commission 2021). It is intended for an audience at the intersection of technical and social concerns focused on translating knowledge valorisation and community engagement into fitting digital platforms.

Acknowledgements

This publication is part of co-creation efforts of the European Commission's internal community of communities and their community managers. This material, and its internal content applications, has gone through extensive prototyping with these community members from a vast variety of technical, political, and social usage backgrounds. We are immensely grateful for the input and feedback provided.

1 Introduction

Fostering the gap between knowledge and action, community engagement exercises can ensure policies that are not only innovative but also deeply rooted in the realities of those they aim to serve. The recent European Commission recommendation on the participation of citizens and civil society organisations in public policymaking (OJ L, 2023/2836) outlines how citizen participation in general can help earning and establishing, fostering, and making durable trust in governments during each step of the policy cycle by making citizens' voices heard and tapping into their collective intelligence (Boucher et al. 2023, European Commission 2024d, OECD 2024a).

Relatedly, as the OECD (2024b) puts forward in their report on global trends in government innovation, digital and innovative foundations for efficient public services that centre on the human and that provide collaborative (and democratic) spaces are essential. As such, digital means can further help to close the gap between scattered local realities and large-scale public governance systems by scaling up community processes in manifold ways to address policy implementation complexity (Burkett and McNeill 2024). For example, digital grassroots movements, digital agorae and commons, or open-source development efforts might contribute to closing engagement/ action gaps (PPMI, TNO and Verian 2024).

However, while opportunities for connection and facilitation drive the digitisation of community engagement efforts - for example in providing multilingualism options, hosting virtual connections across borders, incentivising gamifications supporting policy learning and uptake, or improving moderation and knowledge synthesis automation with the help of AI -, some challenges could undermine their credibility and positive impact.

1. Fragmented platform ecosystems make it hard to identify fitting engagement spaces - establishing digital engagement hubs is necessary to channel interactions between citizens and public administrations in a meaningful manner where participants don't get lost in a litany of platforms and accounts.

Scattered and disjointed digital ecosystems make it difficult for stakeholders to identify appropriate engagement spaces. This complexity highlights the need for centralised digital engagement hubs to facilitate interactions between citizens and public administrations. Such hubs can streamline access, provide clearer pathways for participation, and foster meaningful dialogue by preventing users from becoming overwhelmed by multiple platforms and fragmented processes (Janssen and Estevez 2013, Kenney and Zysman 2016). Moreover, a well-designed hub acts as a locus for governance, balancing incentives, and ensuring equitable participation. The integration of networked open-source solutions and global good practices can further enhance these hubs, ensuring continuous innovation and responsiveness to diverse needs (Shirky 2008, Srnicek 2016, Sobota et al. 2025).

2. Human interaction in the digital space can be difficult because of misinformation, imposturing, influencing, bots, and attacks - human facilitation as well as balancing legal and technical data security and accessibility aspects are necessary to ensure transparency and accountability.

Human interaction in digital spaces often faces hurdles such as misinformation, imposturing, bot interference, and cyberattacks (Zuboff 2019). Robust community governance, moderation and facilitation mechanisms are essential to address these issues, combining transparent facilitation with legal and technical measures to ensure data security and accessibility (Chadwick 2013). Human facilitators play a critical role in mediating discussions, ensuring respectful dialogue, and synthesising

knowledge effectively. Balancing these efforts with cultural sensitivity and global-local considerations is vital for creating trust and ensuring the credibility of digital platforms (Sunstein 2018, Bail 2021).

3. Digital and social competences might be lacking to meaningfully participate – community onboarding efforts and physical links to the digital exercise are necessary to ensure and promote the exercise’s value and link to policymaking beyond a digital platform.

A lack of digital and social skills can hinder meaningful participation in engagement exercises, especially for underrepresented groups (European Commission 2022). To address this, comprehensive onboarding strategies must integrate physical and digital dimensions, connecting digital efforts to tangible local realities. Providing education through digital learning platforms, fostering trust through community-driven initiatives, and amplifying local voices to a global audience can help overcome these barriers. Such efforts should prioritise accessibility and inclusivity to bridge digital divides and foster equitable participation (Castells 2010, Bertot et al. 2010, Noveck 2015).

4. Over-engineering digital tools instead of focusing on social facilitation aspects makes purpose and engagement designs too vague for meaningful outputs (“A digital tool won’t be the solution itself”) – establishing long-term thinking and contextual impact in an embedded manner is necessary.

Focusing solely on the technological aspects of digital tools risks diluting the purpose of community engagement exercises. Over-engineered solutions can lead to unstructured digital spaces, undermining their effectiveness. Instead, digital platforms should prioritise social facilitation and long-term thinking, embedding engagement efforts in iterative policy cycles that include evaluation and foresight exercises (OECD 2024, European Commission 2024d). Platforms designed with a focus on sustained improvement, trust-building, and contextual responsiveness foster deeper community involvement and more meaningful policy outcomes (Peixoto and Fox 2016, van Bavel and Packer 2021).

Enhancing community engagement through digital platforms

In the outlined digital age, platforms have become indispensable tools for facilitating community engagement, allowing individuals and communities to connect, collaborate, and participate actively in governance and decision-making processes across boundaries. These platforms offer large-scale opportunities for transparency, collaboration, and innovation in public engagement and administrative workflows, but also need to offer safeguards against potential erosional tendencies as outlined above.

This ties into the European Commission’s policy and research agendas from various points of view. Based on the Digital Services Act (OJ L, L 2022/2065), the AI Act (OJ L, L2024/1689) and the Defence of Democracy Package (European Commission 2023b), foci are on citizen engagement (European Commission 2020, 2023a, 2024a), digital competences for citizens (European Commission 2022), algorithmic transparency (European Commission 2024c), trustworthy public communications (European Commission 2024d), public administration modernisation and the digital transition (European Commission 2024b) as well as community governance (European Commission 2021, 2023c, 2024e, 2024f).

Whilst communities can certainly work without digital tools, they can thrive better when enhanced by digital spaces to connect and co-create beyond the usual suspects. The presented community digital compass provides thinking steps in how to select digital platforms suitable for specific community engagement exercises with a particular attention to IT solutions to enrich the socio-political guidance available in the European Commission’s Communities of Practice

Playbook and its additional capacity-building materials (European Commission 2021, 2024e,f). The compass also feeds into further JRC research on digital community platform governance (European 2023c).

The community digital compass includes some ecosystem exploration questions to set the community requirements scene, a set of 39 platform selection questions navigating the digital community-scapes, and hands-on materials to use for community platform selection exercises.

It helps making up your mind which platform solutions could work best for your community use case by covering questions in the realms of access granted, community ambitions, engagement preferred, user experience, integrations foreseen, security and privacy, and fitting budget. Additionally in annex, it offers working sheet templates to check, once chosen, elements of a minimum viable (*mvp*) community platform, and to co-define community platform governance models, once rolled out.

Box 1. The community digital compass: overview of provided community platform selection guidance materials

<p>While the compass is agnostic to which corporate and market tools to choose from, it provides the following materials to support community platform selection and implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">— community platform contextualisation on digital governance and engagement— community platform scoping question to pin down the ecosystem/ action context— community platform selection questions to choose a fitting platform— community platform selection process flows— community platform worksheet on its minimum viable product— community platform guidance on its governance models

These community digital compass materials enable you:

- to understand and explore community platform design and rollout both from a social and technical perspective.
- to design and justify community platform requirements in a conversation between policy and IT processes.
- to define and apply functional community management by providing guided question for feature exploration.

2 The community digital compass – a community platforms exploration tool

A community is a group of people who "share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly" (Wenger-Trayner 2015). Consequently, communities centre on "learning-by-doing" and are social convening powerhouses (Wenger-Trayner et al. 2023).

In the digital era, communities are critical in shaping adaptable policy engagement models. Thus, the community digital compass is a hands-on guide designed to help organisations and project/community managers move from theoretical discussions to practical decisions. It provides structured tools such as checklists, prioritisation frameworks, and workshop templates that support informed decision-making in selecting and governing digital community platforms. It enables decision-makers to explore both the social and technical dimensions of platform selection, align policy and IT perspectives, and establish governance models that foster community resilience.

The compass is structured into three elements: 1. scoping considerations, 2. selection elements, and 3. exercises and additional guidance materials.

2.1 Contextualising digital community governance

To understand the potential setup and purpose-driven design of a digital community platform, its role in broader governance frameworks needs to be understood.

Since digital platforms can be designed to serve many different purposes, understanding the socio-political context in which the specific community platform will be embedded helps scoping their features. Figure 1 outlines three governance paradigms - open government, sustainability, and locality/community – and spells out how digital platform trends relate to them.

Based on this normative understanding of where and how community contributes to digital governance goals, platform ambitions can be shaped.

Figure 1: Overview Table of Digital Governance (Community) Paradigms

<i>Evolutionary tendency related to governance paradigm / Key elements</i>	Evolutionary tendency 1 Open government demand pull participation	Evolutionary tendency 2 Sustainability hybrid co-creation	Evolutionary tendency 3 Locality and community supply push participation
Digital transformation (relevant trend)	Deliberative platforms. Opportunity to opens government processes to the communities to ultimately enable community participation in decision-making.	Deliberative and collaborative platforms. Space to align the open government processes with sustainability goals and the quintuple helix approach. Also, bottom-up sensing platforms led by communities can present new business models to create more circular or nature-based solutions.	Sensing and tech devices. Capacity of building on bottom-up technologies and evidence-based participation from communities. Also, collaborative platforms could enable a push from the community for change in policies.

(source: European Commission 2023c)

Figure 2 complements the thinking about how to bridge platforms with social governance structures by identifying practical recommendations for public administrations and communities, focusing on co-creation, transparency, and leveraging technological innovations. These recommendations stress the balance between top-down policy creation and grassroots participation, supported by tools that ensure sustainability and replicability.

Together, both frameworks provide the digital platform governance context for designing community engagement exercises.

Figure 2: Overview Table of Digital Governance (Community) Paradigms

General recommendations <i>For PA:</i>	Actively involve the community to define the scope and what decision-making process is open. If agenda is set in stone by the PA, it may risk becoming an exercise of legitimising policy decisions.	Explore new ways or technologies to catalyse communities' claims exposed via social media platforms in an official way. Facilitate the meeting spaces between companies and communities to co-create a common agenda approved by both actors.	Be bureaucratically creative to facilitate and use bottom-up initiatives and insights from the communities. Promote internal agility to accommodate new sources of data and contributions.
<i>For Communities:</i>	Contribution and Collaboration with the public administration (top-down co-creation). Appreciate that setting the agenda is about strengthening the vision of the policymakers and the one of the community and not one alone.	Collaborate and Co-creation. Relying on well-known international communities in the field of sustainability, climate change, and circular economy (trusted reputation). Prepare and plan for medium term commitment.	Collaborate and Co-creation. Importance of creating and using open-source technologies. It is related to transparency and the possibility of easy replication.
How can technological trends support these recommendations?	Deliberative platforms can enable communities to participate through official channels even though there is an opportunity in the collaborative platforms to find solutions to be adopted by governments. Also, social media channels can help to bring people to the official platforms and to disseminate the results.	Deliberative enables top-down co-creation of policies. On the contrary, collaborative and sensing platforms facilitate the bottom-up co-creation of initiatives relevant to sustainability. Cycles of both can facilitate the overall medium-term process towards sustainability outcomes. Social media will help to maintain the common agenda as an auditor/fact checker to inform public opinion.	Sensing and tech devices can boost community energy into bottom-up initiatives and social media to bring people on board. Deliberative platforms can give a regulatory framework to support these sensing initiatives and a common narrative. Collaborative platforms can help organise and finance the initiatives and bring the community's agenda to the policymakers.

(source: European Commission 2023c)

2.2 Contextualising the community to choose a digital platform

Next to contextualising the governance paradigms through which communities contribute via digital platforms, understanding the community's specific context is important. Understanding the ecosystem in which a specific community interacts allows to identify digital engagement strengths and weaknesses as well as opportunities and threats to its meaningful built-up.

Table 1 builds on the paradigms outlined in figures 1 and 2 by offering a structured approach to align strategic goals, operational methods, and stakeholder involvement, ensuring community exercises are impactful and inclusive in the digital realm. The table is structured around three key phases - exploration, sensemaking, and reflection - helping you to articulate your platform needs, resources, and ecosystems. By addressing "What," "How," and "Who" questions, the framework

supports your initial business decisions to get the baselines right to choose a digital platform fitting your context.

By applying this structured approach, you can navigate the complexities of digital community engagement with clarity and purpose. The table's scene-setting questions not only aid in defining strategic directions but also ensure that operational embedding and stakeholder involvement are aligned with the overarching goals and technical possibilities, resulting in more impactful and trustworthy digital community engagement processes.

Once you have decided on and implemented a digital community platform, Annexes 4 and 5 provide you with actionable questions to define your initial feature/ engagement design and your community platform governance.

Table 1. Scoping questions to pin down the ecosystem/ action context in which community platform selection happens

	1. EXPLORATION PHASE	2. SENSEMAKING PHASE	3. REFLECTION PHASE	
<p>WHAT?</p> <p>Strategic Alignment: Objectives and Goals</p>	<p>What is your engagement exercise about?</p> <p>Will it be mostly an internal or external exercise?</p> <p>Does it focus on building a community, fostering a network, or enhancing communication?</p>	<p>What are the potential outcomes expected from this exercise?</p>	<p>How do these outcomes align with your organisational goals and the engagement platform in question?</p>	<p>Are there overlapping platforms or opportunities for cross-fertilisation?</p>
<p>HOW?</p> <p>Operational Embedding: Processes and Methodologies</p>	<p>What do you dream the participants will achieve or contribute through their engagement in terms of behaviours exhibited?</p>	<p>Where do you situate the engagement locus?</p> <p>Will your exercise happen rather in the digital or physical space(s), or will it be a hybrid one?</p> <p>Will it be more local, regional, national, or cross-border?</p>	<p>How can the digital platform design and ecosystem facilitate the expected goals?</p>	
<p>WHO?</p> <p>Stakeholder involvement: Members and Stakeholders</p>	<p>Who are the key stakeholders and their engagement behaviours?</p>	<p>What resources and competences are available to support this exercise?</p> <p>Who will manage and sustain the community?</p> <p>What digital and social skills are needed to ensure meaningful participation?</p>	<p>How do you plan to communicate the value of the exercise on the platform to stakeholders and onboard them effectively to ensure sustained participation?</p>	<p>How do you ensure implementation fit?</p>

(source: authors)

2.3 Exploring community platform options

When selecting a community platform, it is essential to approach the process with a set of foundational questions that guide decision-making. The compass offers those questions in the following. These questions serve as an initial filter, offering yes/no assessments that can be further refined and prioritised based on the specific needs and contexts of each community use case. Rather than prescribing one-size-fits-all solutions, this approach empowers organisations and community managers to adapt strategic platform selection and design based on required features stemming from their communities' objectives, user bases, and operational environments.

The core purpose of these guiding questions is to provide a structured, universal framework that addresses critical dimensions of platform selection, such as accessibility, integration capabilities, user experience, security, and alignment with community goals. They enable decision-makers to evaluate whether a platform meets baseline requirements before tailoring it to specific engagement ambitions.

The following set of 39 questions outlines these agnostic guiding questions, aiming at facilitating concrete platform selection. While they form the backbone of the evaluation process, they need to be enriched with context-specific considerations and detailed explorations aligned to the organisation's (technical ecosystem) vision and the community's use case as outlined beforehand. This ensures that the selected platform not only fulfils technical and functional criteria but also supports sustainable, impactful, and inclusive community engagement.

Box 2. The seven community platform selection areas to explore and define requirements

- Access

This area draws attention to whom shall have access to your platform in which capacity (7 questions).

- Platform ambitions

This area draws attention to the platform's main engagement purpose (7 questions).

- Engagement

This area draws attention to the platform's main engagement mechanics and how contributions shall be made possible (8 questions).

- User experience

This area draws attention to how platform users are able to navigate the platform (8 questions).

- Integrations

This area draws attention to how the platform is able to accommodate different ecosystem designs (3 questions).

- Security and privacy

This area draws attention to which options are available to design a safe platform environment (3 questions).

- Budget

This area draws attention to questions of resource availability (3 questions).

2.3.1 Access

This area draws attention to whom shall have access to your platform in which capacity.

Ensuring proper access to community platforms is crucial for successful digital engagement adoption. This access goes beyond login credentials and single-sign-ons: it defines who can participate, what content is visible, and how securely sensitive data is handled.

To start, the platform's evolving future audience has to be clearly defined: Is it for internal use only, or will external audiences be granted access? Will there be a significant shift in audience targeting so that open/ public membership features need to be foreseen, even if they are not yet used from the beginning? Additionally, community managers need to decide whether secured login is mandatory for accessing content and network information, especially when sensitive non-classified data and federated systems are involved.

Organisations may also consider whether to fully externalise data access, retention, and analysis, or keep it in-house, especially when dealing with sensitive information. Outsourcing platform administration to external staff raises similar concerns. While it may offer operational benefits, it introduces potential risks regarding data integrity and security, not to speak of community engagement flow breaks. Ultimately, thoughtful decisions around access are key to building trust, ensuring security, and encouraging meaningful participation.

Box 3. Community platform selection area: Access - questions to explore & define requirements

- Is secured login mandatory to access content such as blogs, events, members' profiles, etc.?
- Is your community platform limited to an internal audience only?
- Is your community platform possibly used to grant access to an external audience?
- Is your community platform visible and open for registration for an external audience?
- Is it possible to fully externalise data access, retention, and analysis outside your organisation? (including its contractors)
- Do you need to handle sensitive-non classified (SNC) data on your platform?
- Is it possible to outsource the administration of the platform to external staff outside your organisation?

2.3.2 Platform ambitions

This area draws attention to the platform's main engagement purpose.

When building a community platform, clearly defining its ambitions is essential to guide its development and ensure its effectiveness. The platform's primary engagement purpose will shape the user experience, content, and features, making it vital to align the platform's technical requirements with the needs of the community. Ideally, these thoughts are embedded within a futures scoping exercise to ensure that the platform's technical capacities can mirror evolving community needs.

Understanding whether the platform is intended for communication, connection, collaboration, or another focus helps to ensure that it meets its objectives efficiently. For instance, if the platform is used mainly for communication purposes, its design will be less focusing on user/ member input than

on the organisation's. On the other hand, if the primary goal is connection, the platform's requirements will centre more on facilitating networking and engagement among community members. Platforms with a focus on citizen science might need specific tools for data collection and analysis, while those centred on training would require courses and learning modules. Collaboration platforms, in turn, would need functionalities like shared workspaces or content co-creation tools, whereas those intended for deliberation should foster thoughtful discussion, opinion sense-making and targeted decision-making processes.

Another key consideration is whether the platform's purpose is time-limited, such as for a specific project or event, as this would influence both the design and resources allocated to its maintenance and strategic ecosystem integration.

Box 4. Community platform selection area: Platform ambitions - questions to explore & define requirements

- Is the platform mostly used for communication or (social) media purposes?
- Is the platform mostly used for connection purposes?
- Is the platform mostly used for science/ technology sensing purposes?
- Is the platform mostly used for training purposes?
- Is the platform mostly used for (content) collaboration purposes?
- Is the platform mostly used for deliberative purposes?
- Is the platform's purpose time-limited?

2.3.3 Engagement

This area draws attention to the platform's main engagement mechanics and how contributions shall be made possible.

Engagement mechanics play a crucial role in ensuring meaningful contributions and sustained involvement from its users on a community platform. The way users interact with the platform directly impacts their experience and the platform's success. The following four points outline why it is important to carefully consider how engagement will be facilitated and what features are needed to support various forms of contribution towards community goals.

First, a community platform may require diverse content types to accommodate different engagement styles responding to specific community goals: such as ideation mechanisms, discussion forums and polls, or topics and events embedding multimedia content. While a diversity of content types allows users to participate in ways that align with their preferences, limiting available content types simplifies user experience and channels their engagement towards intended community goals. Making sure that the content types available on a community platform are flexible to use and to (de)activate as need arises considers a community's multiple possible pathways and evolving user persona.

Second, recognition features could motivate users by rewarding active contributors and building community roles and a sense of credibility within the community. Similarly, gamification elements, like points or badges, can encourage more frequent participation and engagement by making the experience more interactive and rewarding.

Third, knowledge management features like taxonomy management and folksonomy inputs can help structure/ categorise content, making information easier to find and more relevant to feature. For platforms aiming to engage diverse and cross-border communities, supporting multilingualism is also vital since a platform that accommodates multiple languages ensures inclusivity and accessibility for all members.

Fourth, ensuring the platform is mobile-friendly and supports notifications, such as through emails and managed newsletters, is essential for keeping users informed and engaged in real-time or as they wish to set their rhythm, no matter where they are. This keeps engagement consistent and responsive.

Box 5. Community platform selection area: Engagement - questions to explore & define requirements

- Do you need a set of different engagement content types on the platform?
- Do you need some reputation management or recognition awarding features?
- Do you need some gamification features?
- Does the platform support taxonomy management?
- Does the platform support folksonomy?
- Is multilingualism supported by the platform?
- Does the platform have a mobile version available?
- Does the platform provide notifications (via emails)?

2.3.4 User experience

This area draws attention to how platform users are able to navigate the platform.

Shaping meaningful user experiences is a critical factor in the success of a community platform. Focusing on the easing of navigation and targeted user interaction, a straightforward onboarding process for both administrators and users alike ensures smooth adoption and minimises the learning curve to engage around the community's goals.

In that regard, customisability is a key consideration. The platform should allow for the implementation of a unique user experience design and visual identity to reflect both the organisation's and community's branding. It is important that site owners can manage the platform as autonomously as possible to reduce reliance on time-consuming technical support.

The ability to automatically assign users to security and community groups based on attributes enhances efficiency, while the platform should also represent both online and offline engagement layers in a simple, user-friendly way.

Additionally, scalability is essential to accommodate growing communities and evolving scope requirements. For instance, what starts as one issue-based community could evolve into a community with a broader vision or a hub of communities tackling the issue at hand from different, complementary perspectives and working methods. Being able to accommodate multi-community instance requests, whilst allowing for individualised community experience, might be a strategic choice to make to lessen overall cost pressures across communities.

Box 6. Community platform selection area: User experience - questions to explore & define requirements

- Is the process to onboard administrators onto the platform's functionalities straightforward?
- Can site owners be autonomous?
- Do you need to implement your own user experience design and visual identity on the platform?
- Is the platform customisable to meet specific needs?
- Is the platform scalable to meet growing needs?
- Is the process to onboard users onto the platform's functionalities straightforward?
- Is it possible to assign users automatically to security and community groups based on specific attributes?
- Is the platform able to represent different layers of online and analogue engagement simply?

2.3.5 Integrations

This area draws attention to how the platform is able to accommodate different ecosystem designs.

Integrations are critical to ensure that a community platform can adapt to various ecosystem designs. One important consideration is whether the platform can host multiple communities within a single instance, allowing distinct groups to interact under the same framework while maintaining separate spaces and engagement modes.

The need for external features, such as integrating third-party tools or services, is another key aspect. Replying to continuously emerging community needs, these could include data analytics, enhanced collaboration tools, or social media integrations to enlarge the platform's functionalities whilst maintaining corporate IT guidelines.

Additionally, data migration capabilities are crucial for organisations transitioning to or from other systems, ensuring that existing data can be smoothly transferred without losing valuable information and connections to ensure a smooth continuity of users' experiences with a changing platform.

Box 7. Community platform selection area: Integrations - questions to explore & define requirements

- Will you need to host multiple communities within a single instance?
- Will you need to have additional external features on your platform?
- Is data migration possible?

2.3.6 Security and privacy

This area draws attention to which options are available to design a safe platform environment.

Security and (data) privacy are fundamental to designing a safe and trustworthy community platform. On the one hand, granular user permission management allows organisations and community managers alike to control who has access to specific content and features, ensuring sensitive data is protected and crucial contributions are possible. For the latter, content moderation is important, as it helps maintain a respectful and safe environment by preventing inappropriate or harmful content.

This might be enhanced by AI tools to identify and act upon moderation needs, synthesise available knowledge, or match user connection needs.

On the other hand, having an easy-to-use mechanism for data protection implementation/ monitoring and ensuring user acceptance of privacy statements are essential for compliance with regulations and safeguarding personal information. This is particularly true for community platforms that have the potential to ask for, use and create a lot of data. Additionally, advanced AI systems implemented within a community platform and drawing on its data might require specific technical and legal guardrails.

Box 8. Community platform selection area: Security and privacy - questions to explore & define requirements

- Do you need granular user permission management on the platform?
- Do you need content moderation on the platform?
- Has the platform an easy mechanism for data protection monitoring and statement acceptance/ follow-up?

2.3.7 Budget

This area draws attention to questions of resource availability.

When considering the budget for a community platform, it is crucial to evaluate whether the platform’s pricing aligns with the available financial resources. A clear and simple pricing structure for licenses, development, implementation, and hosting costs helps avoid unexpected expenses and ensures transparency for future platform selection and scaling opportunity comparisons.

Opting for an open-source platform can significantly reduce costs and allows for shared IT development and community-driven enhancements, potentially lowering implementation expenses while also offering flexibility for customisations.

Box 9. Community platform selection area: Budget - questions to explore & define requirements

- Does the platform's price fit within the foreseen budget?
- Is the platform open source so that IT development could be distributed and openly beneficial?
- Does the platform have a simple price structure for license, development, implementation, and hosting costs?

2.4 Exploration exercises: process suggestions on how to select your community platform

You can use the presented materials in three different manners to brainstorm, codify and justify your community platform requirements and selection decision.

1. Use them as checklists. You can journal and mark must-, should-, and could-haves.
2. Use them as templates for sensemaking team workshops and guided conversations between social and technical teams involved in community requirements design and implementation.
3. Use them to run prioritisation ranking exercises to distil what is important for you to justify community platform selection.

You find all materials to use digitally and physically in the annexes: the scoping questions to pin down your action context, the selection questions, and cards to choose a fitting community platform, as well as the community platform mvp overview and the community platform governance template.

2.4.1 As checklist

Purpose: The materials used as checklists provide: (1) an overview of questions and elements to think of during community platform selection and implementation, and (2) a continuous journal of community platform selection must-, should-, and could-haves as well as rollout and governance questions for planning and implementation.

Table 2. How to use the materials as checklists

MATERIALS NEEDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — If no platform has been selected yet, print or access digitally the provided scoping and selection questions. — If a platform has already been selected, print or access digitally the provided platform mvp checklist and the platform governance template. — If working with printed copies, have pens and sticky notes ready. — If working digitally, make sure to provide a collaborative environment where to reply to and check off questions.
TIME NEEDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 30 - 45 minutes individual review and reflection
ROLES INVOLVED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Programme/ community/ policy managers looking to make sense of what community platform they need <i>OR</i> — UX designers and IT experts/ support to understand context for platform/ feature choices
ACTIONS TO RUN	<p>If no platform has been selected yet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Move through the scoping template and identify and define your most pressing issues. — Check the platform selection template questions and prioritise them by yes/ no answers.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Journal Must-Haves: Identify critical features and functionalities that are non-negotiable for your platform. — Mark Should-Haves: Highlight features that add value but are not essential for the initial implementation. — Note Could-Haves: Capture features that are nice-to-have but can be deprioritised or added later. <p>If a platform has already been selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Refresh the platform’s context via the already given answers to the scoping and selection questions. — Use the platform mvp checklist to ensure essential feature and content rollout is guaranteed. — Once established, use the platform governance template to shape secure community engagement.
OUTPUT CREATED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Project QA document — Document must-, should-, and could-haves for reference in later steps of the selection process. — Preparation for team discussion workshop

(source: authors)

2.4.2 As workshop and conversation te(a)mlate

Purpose: This exercise is designed to facilitate sensemaking workshops and guide conversations between social/ political and technical teams. Participants can collaboratively prioritise and align on community platform requirements or platform governance in an interactive and structured manner.

Table 3. How to use the materials as workshop and conversation te(a)mlates

MATERIALS NEEDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — If no platform has been selected yet, print or access digitally the provided scoping questions and selection prioritisation cards. — If a platform has already been selected, print or access digitally the provided platform mvp checklist and the platform governance template. — If working with a printed (ideally A0) copy to have conversations around, have pens and sticky notes ready. — If working digitally, make sure to provide a collaborative environment where to move cards flexibly according to your prioritisations.
TIME NEEDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 60 - 90 minutes workshop plus 15 minutes setup (can be part of checklist process)
ROLES INVOLVED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Social team: Community managers with(out) their core groups, as applicable, to prepare conversation in a first round with — IT and UX experts and support, in a second round, facilitated by a moderator to guide discussions of initial requirements outcome.
ACTIONS TO RUN	<p>If no platform has been selected yet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Set the scene by asking the scoping questions. Zoom into what is most important for your use case.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Go through the set of platform selection cards and categorise them into <i>must-have</i>, <i>should-have</i>, and <i>could-have</i> categories. Exclude irrelevant cards by turning them around. — Enrich the must-haves with detailed descriptions of what you would like the users to be able to do on the platform. — Cross-check the prioritised must-have features against what is available to use in your context to validate feasibility and alignment. — If feasible, continue conversation on should-haves. — Draw up and converge on an UX-enriched list of must-have platform requirements and a roadmap for should-haves. <p>If a platform has already been selected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Provide participants with a brief introduction to the platform’s context via the already co-created consensus on the scoping and selection questions. — Use the platform mvp checklist to discuss how to ensure essential feature and content rollout is handled by whom. — Once established, use the platform governance template with relevant actors to discuss how to shape secure community engagement.
OUTPUT CREATED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Prioritised and UX-enriched platform requirements list — Platform priorities and documented next steps — Justifications for platform selection based in prioritisation exploration — Consensus-driven prioritisation of features and alignment across technical and social teams

(source: authors)

2.4.3 As prioritisation ranking exercise

Purpose: Use a Fibonacci probability ranking (*Planning Poker*, c.f. Mallidi and Sharma 2021) approach to distil and justify the most critical qualities for community platform selection. This method encourages team-based decision-making, ensuring alignment between social and technical stakeholders. The outcome is a clear, structured, and justified prioritisation document to guide your platform selection and implementation.

Table 4. How to use the materials as prioritisation ranking exercise

MATERIALS NEEDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Digital collaboration board or physical board (with distinct sections/markers for must-/should-/could-haves) — Platform selection prioritisation cards, printed or movable on digital collaboration board — Fibonacci Planning Poker cards (1, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21) or digital equivalents
TIME NEEDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 60–90 minutes workshop plus 15 minutes setup after te(a)mplate conversations
ROLES INVOLVED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Social team: Community managers without their core groups in a first round, with their core groups in a second confirmation round after in-house priorities have been cleared for feasibility — IT and UX experts and support in the first round

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Moderator to guide playing
ACTIONS TO RUN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Provide each participant with a set of Fibonacci Planning Poker cards or digital equivalents. — Share the answers to the scoping questions in advance so everyone understands the broader needs. — Each participant individually and hidden assigns a Fibonacci number to indicate priority for each criterion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1, 3: Lower priority or optional features. 5, 8: Medium priority; important but not critical. 13, 21: High priority; must-have, possibly deal-breaking features. — Reveal all cards simultaneously to avoid bias. — Build consensus by inviting to share their reasoning of rankings differ significantly. Remind participants they can skip criteria they feel uncertain about to focus on the items that stand out to co-define their qualities.
OUTPUT CREATED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Final prioritised list of platform requirements and qualities, categorised as must-, should-, or could-haves. — Collaborative visualisation of ranked criteria. — Documented, justified prioritisation ready to inform next steps in platform selection and rollout.

(source: authors)

2.5 A minimum viable community platform

Once you have established which digital community platform you would like to use, two questions need answers:

1. What is it that you need to have implemented on the platform before its launch in terms of engagement strategy, platform structures/ content, and necessary platform features?

In the beginning, no platform solution needs to come with all possible features the community will ever use - rather, try to identify what really counts for your community use case.

What would you like your members to be able to do on the platform? Which member behaviours would you like to observe, encourage and translate into your platform features?

To establish a foundational platform for a nascent community to encourage early engagement, focus on simplicity and scalability. From this engagement strategy and member requirements, easy structures and eventual features will follow.

[The worksheet in Annex 4 provides you with a checklist overview.](#)

2. What will your community platform governance look like?

Once your platform is up and running in its pilot phase, you will need to refine how things are done on it.

What would you like to achieve via the platform, how?

To establish a long-term, welcoming community platform, take into account the following governance aspects and actions:

- Designing your community goals and membership engagement practices on the platform: focus on SMART goals and map relevant features to shape or roll out.
- Setting up user verification and content moderation mechanisms: consider member types and related rights and fitting additional/ changed content variations.
- Applying community communications and support: onboard members by facilitating a variety of (a)synchronous touchpoints, from 1:1s over short group meetings to automated chats and learning curves.

[The worksheet in Annex 5 provides you with an overview of design questions.](#)

3 Conclusions

Communities are much more than their tools - but without a proper digital tool to connect, communicate and co-create, they are falling behind their possibilities. Current trends in transformative, mission-oriented innovation policies further introduce novel demands on innovation systems, pushing policymakers to invest in community platform ecosystems (OECD 2024b, Sobota et al. 2025).

In this arena, engagement is both a social and technical endeavour where designing tool requirements needs to bridge IT and business requirements while allowing enough flexibility for a community management team to co-create 'what could be.'

The material presented in the community digital compass is deliberately hands-on, designed to help organisations and project/ community managers alike to move from theoretical discussions to practical decisions. By offering structured tools like checklists, prioritisation frameworks, and workshop templates, the materials enable to:

- facilitate cross-team conversations that integrate technical, UX, and strategic perspectives.
- align on platform requirements and ensure they are rooted in engagement goals.
- select a platform that balances functionality, simplicity, and user-centred design.

This approach ensures that platform selection is not just a technical decision but a collaborative, iterative process that aligns with broader policy objectives and organisational community goals. The outcomes are simple, actionable documents that summarise findings, outline priorities, and align all stakeholders on a shared vision for the platform.

Looking ahead, a few trends will shape the next wave of community-centric platforms.

These trends address the four main challenges that could undermine the credibility and positive impacts of digitising community engagement efforts as raised in the introduction to this compass:

1. *Human interaction in the digital space can be difficult because of misinformation, imposturing, influencing, bots, and attacks* - human facilitation as well as balancing legal and technical data security and accessibility aspects is necessary to ensure transparency and accountability.

Authenticity will be key. Building trust takes time and continued efforts. Co-designing the community's purpose and actions ensures long-term participatory engagement and credible learning- and leading-by-doing relationships, accepting engagement fluctuations along the journey. In contrast to large-scale social media platforms, community-driven action will gain in traction.

2. *Digital and social competences might be lacking to meaningfully participate* – community onboarding efforts and physical links to the digital exercise are necessary to ensure and promote the exercise's value and link to policymaking beyond a digital platform.

Design and simplicity remain critical to lower access barriers and spark genuine participation. Platforms that are visually cohesive, easy to navigate, and provide hubs will motivate diverse users to contribute to actions in the sea of endless online spaces where purpose is not defined and attention short.

Non-blueprint approaches emphasise continuous experimentation, ensuring platforms remain user-focused and responsive to evolving needs from both policy sponsorship and stakeholder perspectives. Capturing metrics focused on meaningful knowledge and practice retention and re-use will ensure measuring for community sustainability and purpose beyond technicalities.

3. *Over-engineering of digital tools instead of focusing on the social facilitation aspects makes engagement and purpose designs vague and too unspecific for meaningful outputs* (“A digital tool won’t be the solution itself”) – establishing long-term thinking and contextual impact in an embedded manner is necessary.

Meaning and sustainability emerge from unlocking cross-regional and cross-thematic interactions, increasingly supported by AI-driven tools that synthesise insights and facilitate meaningful group connections. Advertently, mis- and disinformation fuelled through AI content creation and personifications need to be addressed to guarantee safe spaces.

4. Fragmented platform ecosystems make it hard to identify fitting engagement spaces - establishing digital engagements hubs is necessary to channel interactions between citizens and public administrations in a meaningful manner where participants don’t get lost in a litany of platforms and accounts.

Decentralised, hubbed impact is the future. Linking local initiatives to broader, multi-level frameworks and networks for collective knowledge sharing and action advocacy is to build bridges. Curating community-driven content and orchestrating diverse convening and working methods digitally and place-based for innovation missions is the now and the future.

In conclusion, policy goals and community practice must evolve in tandem: pragmatic, on-the-ground insights need to inform broader governance endeavours, while open-source solutions provide scalable, sovereign models for community-building aligning with the values of neutrality, inclusivity, and data protection. Embracing these digital civic technology trends can help communities stay adaptive, collaborative, and equipped to meet both local and mission-oriented challenges – offering community platform solutions for people and policy alike.

References

Bail, Christopher, *Breaking the Social Media Prism: How to Make Our Platforms Less Polarizing*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2021.

Bennett, W. L., Segerberg, A., 'The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics', *Information, Communication & Society*, Vol. 15, No 5, 2012, pp. 739-768.

Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., Grimes, J. M., 'Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for societies', *Government Information Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 3, 2010, pp. 264-271.

Boucher, S., Hallin, C. A., Paulson, L., *The Routledge Handbook of Collective Intelligence for Democracy and Governance*, Routledge, London, 2023.

Burkett, I., McNeill J., 'Governance in and for complexity', Griffith Centre for Systems Innovation, 2024, <https://medium.com/good-shift/governance-in-and-for-complexity-eac108d8b589>.

Castells, M., *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, MA, 2010.

Chadwick, A., *The Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013.

European Commission: *Citizens' Engagement Platform Factsheet*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2024a, https://citizens.ec.europa.eu/document/download/efb5cfcc-a4c1-4f18-bc25-8cffd4653ebf_en?filename=CEP%20Factsheet%20Final.pdf.

European Commission: *Corporate Guidance on Citizen Engagement*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2023a, doi: 10.2775/4453, ISBN 978-92-68-10274-9, https://citizens.ec.europa.eu/document/download/a61dbcb9-9f3e-426f-8944-146c264e6c67_en?filename=Citizen%20Engagement%20Guidance_short1.pdf.

European Commission: *Defence of Democracy Package*, 2023b, https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/priorities-2019-2024/new-push-european-democracy/protecting-democracy_en.

European Commission: Directorate General for Structural Reform Support, *Technical Support Instrument*, 2024b, https://commission.europa.eu/funding-tenders/find-funding/eu-funding-programmes/technical-support-instrument/technical-support-instrument-tsi_en#reform-areas-covered.

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, *European Centre for Algorithmic Transparency*, 2024c, https://algorithmic-transparency.ec.europa.eu/index_en.

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Catana, G.C., Debremaeker, I., Szkola, S.S.E. and Williquet, F., *The Communities of Practice Playbook*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2021, doi:10.2760/443810 (online), 10.2760/42416 (print), JRC122830.

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Errandonea, L., *Exploring the impact of digital transformation on public governance - A community perspective*, Schade, S. editor(s), Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2023c, doi:10.2760/145052, JRC133342.

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Smillie, L. and Scharfbillig, M., *Trustworthy Public Communications*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2024d, doi:10.2760/695605, JRC137725.

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Sormani, P., Valente De Jesus Rosa, P. and Belitrandi, D., *Navigating Diversity: Citizen Engagement in and across the EU*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2020, doi:10.2760/967652, JRC120167.

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Szkola, S., Werbrouck, S. and Williquet, F., *The communities of practice barometer – Guidance and templates*, Publications Office of the European Union, 2024e, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/0749239>

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Szkola, S., Werbrouck, S. and Williquet, F., *The communities of practice checklist – Community actions, roles, and competences*, Publications Office of the European Union, 2024f, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/8175409>

European Commission: Joint Research Centre, Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S. and Punie, Y., *DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens - With new examples of knowledge, skills and attitudes*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2022, doi:10.2760/490274, JRC128415.

Floridi, L., *The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014.

Janssen, M., Estevez, E., 'Lean government and platform-based governance—Doing more with less', *Government Information Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No 1, 2013, pp. S1-S8.

Kenney, M., Zysman, J., 'The rise of the platform economy', *Issues in Science and Technology*, Vol. 32, No. 3, 2016, <https://issues.org/rise-platform-economy-big-data-work/>.

Mallidi, R. K., Sharma, M.: 'Study on Agile Story Point Estimation Techniques and Challenges', *International Journal of Computer Applications*, Vol. 174, No. 13, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.5120/ijca2021921014>

Noveck, B. S., *Smart citizens, smarter state: The technologies of expertise and the future of governing*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2015.

OECD, *OECD Survey on Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions – 2024 Results: Building Trust in a Complex Policy Environment*, 2024a, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9a20554b-en>

OECD, *Global Trends in Government Innovation 2024: Fostering Human-Centred Public Services*, 2024b, OECD Public Governance Reviews, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/c1bc19c3-en>

Official Journal of the European Union, L 277 of 27.10.2022: Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market For Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act), [EUR-Lex - L:2022:277:FULL - EN - EUR-Lex](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/lexuris/ui/uri/2022/277/FULL-EN)

Official Journal of the European Union, L 2023/2836 of 12.12.2023: Commission Recommendation on promoting the engagement and effective participation of citizens and civil society organisations in public policy-making processes, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:L_202302836.

Official Journal of the European Union, L 2024/1689 of 13.06.2024: Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU)

2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act), <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689>.

Peixoto, T., Fox, J., 'When does ICT-enabled citizen voice lead to government responsiveness?', *World Development Report 2016: Digital Dividends*, World Bank, 2016, <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/835741452530215528-0050022016/original/WDR16BPWhenDoesICTEnabledCitizenVoicePeixotoFox.pdf>.

PPMI, TNO, Verian, (on behalf of European Commission), *Future of government as a platform: foresight event insights*, 2024, <https://ppmi.it/news-insights/future-government-platform-foresight-event-insights>.

Shirky, C., *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*, Penguin Press, New York, 2008.

Sobota, V., Wiarda, M., Coenen, T., Ortt, R., 'How can Platform Ecosystems support Mission-Specific Innovation Systems?', *Proceedings of the 58th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 2025, <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/063ad996-c9fe-487a-bc38-40371b61bd06/content>.

Srnicek, N., *Platform Capitalism*, John Wiley & Sons, 2016.

Sunstein, C. R., *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*, Princeton University Press, 2018.

Van Bavel, J.J., Packer, D.J., *The Power of Us: Harnessing Our Shared Identities to Improve Performance, Increase Cooperation, and Promote Social Harmony*, Little Brown, 2021.

Wenger-Trayner, E. and B.: Introduction to communities of practice – A brief overview of the concept and its uses, 2015, <https://www.wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/>.

Wenger-Trayner, E. and B, Reid, P., Bruderlein, C.: *Communities of practice within and across organizations. A Guidebook.*, second edition 2023, ISBN 978 989 53290 5 2.

Zuboff, S., *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*, PublicAffairs, New York, 2019.

List of abbreviations and definitions

Abbreviations	Definitions
EC	European Commission
MVP	Minimum viable product
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

List of boxes

Box 1. The community digital compass: overview of provided community platform selection guidance materials..... 6

Box 2. The seven community platform selection areas to explore and define requirements 11

Box 3. Community platform selection area: Access - questions to explore & define requirements. 12

Box 4. Community platform selection area: Platform ambitions - questions to explore & define requirements 13

Box 5. Community platform selection area: Engagement - questions to explore & define requirements 14

Box 6. Community platform selection area: User experience - questions to explore & define requirements 15

Box 7. Community platform selection area: Integrations - questions to explore & define requirements 15

Box 8. Community platform selection area: Security and privacy - questions to explore & define requirements 16

Box 9. Community platform selection area: Budget - questions to explore & define requirements 16

List of figures

Figure 1: Overview Table of Digital Governance (Community) Paradigms..... 7

Figure 2: Overview Table of Digital Governance (Community) Paradigms..... 8

List of tables

Table 1. Scoping questions to pin down the ecosystem/ action context in which community platform selection happens..... 10

Table 2. How to use the materials as checklists..... 17

Table 3. How to use the materials as workshop and conversation te(a)mplates 18

Table 4. How to use the materials as prioritisation ranking exercise 19

Annexes

ANNEX 1. COMMUNITY PLATFORM SCOPING QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

ANNEX 2. COMMUNITY PLATFORM SELECTION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW CHECKLIST

ANNEX 3. COMMUNITY PLATFORM SELECTION QUESTIONS CARDS

ANNEX 4. COMMUNITY PLATFORM MINIMUM VIABLE PRODUCT CHECKLIST

ANNEX 5. COMMUNITY PLATFORM GOVERNANCE WORKSHEET

ANNEX 1. COMMUNITY PLATFORM SCOPING QUESTIONS OVERVIEW

	1. EXPLORATION PHASE	2. SENSEMAKING PHASE	3. REFLECTION PHASE	
<p>WHAT?</p> <p>Strategic Alignment: Objectives and Goals</p>	<p>What is your engagement exercise about?</p> <p>Will it be mostly an internal or external exercise?</p> <p>Does it focus on building a community, fostering a network, or facilitating communication?</p>	<p>What are the potential outcomes expected from this exercise?</p>	<p>How do these outcomes align with your organisational goals and the engagement platform in question?</p>	<p>Are there overlapping platforms or opportunities for cross-fertilisation?</p>
<p>HOW?</p> <p>Operational Embedding: Processes and Methodologies</p>	<p>What do you dream the participants will achieve or contribute through their engagement in terms of behaviours exhibited?</p>	<p>Where do you situate the engagement locus?</p> <p>Will your exercise happen rather in the digital or physical space(s), or will it be a hybrid one?</p> <p>Will it be more local, regional, national, or cross-border?</p>	<p>How can the digital platform design and ecosystem facilitate the expected goals?</p>	
<p>WHO?</p> <p>Stakeholder involvement: Members and Stakeholders</p>	<p>Who are the key stakeholders and their engagement behaviours?</p>	<p>What resources and competences are available to support this exercise?</p> <p>Who will manage and sustain the community?</p> <p>What digital and social skills are needed to ensure meaningful participation?</p>	<p>How do you plan to communicate the value of the exercise on the platform to stakeholders and onboard them effectively to ensure sustained participation?</p>	<p>How do you ensure implementation fit?</p>

(source: authors)

ANNEX 2. COMMUNITY PLATFORM SELECTION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW CHECKLIST

AREA	DESCRIPTION	QUESTIONS	RELEVANT?
ACCESS	This area draws attention to whom shall have access to your platform in which capacity.	Is secured login mandatory to access content such as blogs, events, members' profiles ...?	
		Is your community platform limited to an internal audience only?	
		Is your community platform possibly used to grant access to an external audience?	
		Is your community platform visible and open for registration for an external audience?	
		Is it possible to fully externalise data access, retention, and analysis outside your organisation? (including its contractors)	
		Do you need to handle sensitive- non classified (SNC) data on your platform?	
		Is it possible to outsource the administration of the platform to external staff outside your organisation?	
PLATFORM AMBITIONS	This area draws attention to the platform's main engagement purpose.	Is the platform mostly used for communication or (social) media purposes?	
		Is the platform mostly used for connection purposes?	
		Is the platform mostly used for science/ technology sensing purposes?	
		Is the platform mostly used for training purposes?	
		Is the platform mostly used for (content) collaboration purposes?	
		Is the platform mostly used for deliberative purposes?	
		Is the platform's purpose time-limited?	
ENGAGEMENT	This area draws attention to the platform's main engagement mechanics and how contributions shall be made possible.	Do you need a set of different engagement content types on the platform?	
		Do you need some reputation management or recognition awarding features?	
		Do you need some gamification features?	
		Does the platform support taxonomy management?	
		Does the platform support folksonomy?	
		Is multilingualism supported by the platform?	
		Does the platform have a mobile version available?	

ANNEX 2. COMMUNITY PLATFORM SELECTION QUESTIONS OVERVIEW CHECKLIST

		Does the platform provide notifications (via emails)?	
USER EXPERIENCE	This area draws attention to how platform users are able to navigate the platform.	Is the process to onboard administrators onto the platform's functionalities straightforward?	
		Can site owners be autonomous?	
		Do you need to implement your own user experience design and visual identity on the platform?	
		Is the platform customisable to meet specific needs?	
		Is the platform scalable to meet growing needs?	
		Is the process to onboard users onto the platform's functionalities straightforward?	
		Is it possible to assign users automatically to security and community groups based on specific attributes?	
		Is the platform able to represent different layers of online and analogue engagement simply?	
INTEGRATIONS	This area draws attention to how the platform is able to accommodate different ecosystem designs.	Will you need to host multiple communities within a single instance?	
		Will you need to have additional external features on your platform?	
		Is data migration possible?	
SECURITY AND PRIVACY	This area draws attention to which options are available to design a safe platform environment.	Do you need granular user permission management on the platform?	
		Do you need content moderation on the platform?	
		Has the platform an easy mechanism for Data Protection Monitoring and Statement acceptance/ follow-up?	
BUDGET	This area draws attention to questions of resource availability.	Does the platform have a simple price structure for license, development, implementation, and hosting costs?	
		Does the platform's price fit within the foreseen budget?	
		Is the platform open source so that IT development could be distributed and openly beneficial?	

(source: authors)



ACCESS

Is secured login mandatory to access content such as blogs, events, members' profiles ..?



ACCESS

Is your community platform limited to an internal audience only?



ACCESS

Is your community platform possibly used to grant access to an external audience?



ACCESS

Is your community platform visible and open for registration for an external audience?





ACCESS

Is it possible to fully externalize data access, retention and analysis outside your organisation (including its contractors)



ACCESS

Do you need to handle sensitive non-classified (SNC) data on your platform?



ACCESS

Is it possible to outsource the administration of the platform to external staff outside your organisation?



PLATFORM AMBITIONS

Is the platform mostly used for communication or (social) media purposes?





PLATFORM AMBITIONS

Is the platform mostly used for connection purposes?



PLATFORM AMBITIONS

Is the platform mostly used for science/ technology sensing purposes?



PLATFORM AMBITIONS

Is the platform mostly used for training purposes?



PLATFORM AMBITIONS

Is the platform mostly used for (content) collaboration purposes?





PLATFORM AMBITIONS

Is the platform mostly used for deliberative purposes?



PLATFORM AMBITIONS

Is the platform's purpose time-limited?



ENGAGEMENT

Do you need a set of different engagement content types on the platform?



ENGAGEMENT

Do you need some reputation management or recognition awarding features?





ENGAGEMENT

Do you need some gamification features?



ENGAGEMENT

Does the platform support taxonomy management?



ENGAGEMENT

Does the platform support folksonomy?



ENGAGEMENT

Is multilingualism supported by the platform?





ENGAGEMENT

Does the platform have a mobile version available?



ENGAGEMENT

Does the platform provide notifications (via emails)?



USER EXPERIENCE

Is the process to onboard administrators onto the platform's functionalities straightforward?



USER EXPERIENCE

Can site owners be autonomous?





USER EXPERIENCE

Do you need to implement your own user experience design and visual identity on the platform?



USER EXPERIENCE

Is the platform customizable to meet specific needs?



USER EXPERIENCE

Is the platform scalable to meet growing needs?



USER EXPERIENCE

Is the process to onboard users onto the platform's functionalities straightforward?





USER EXPERIENCE

Is it possible to assign users automatically to security and community groups based on specific attributes?



USER EXPERIENCE

Is the platform able to represent different layers of online and analog engagement simply?



INTEGRATIONS

Will you need to host multiple communities within a single instance?



INTEGRATIONS

Will you need to have additional external features on your platform?





INTEGRATIONS

Is data migration possible?



SECURITY AND PRIVACY

Do you need granular user permission management on the platform?



SECURITY AND PRIVACY

Do you need content moderation on the platform?



SECURITY AND PRIVACY

Has the platform an easy mechanism for Data Protection Monitoring and Statement acceptance/ follow-up?





BUDGET

Does the platform's price fit within the foreseen budget?



BUDGET

Is the platform open source so that IT development could be distributed and openly beneficial?



BUDGET

Does the platform have a simple price structure for license, development, implementation, and hosting costs?



Your Minimum Viable Community Platform

For any community, having a digital platform/ tools that bridge the knowledge and practices between real life and digital arenas synchronously and asynchronously is essential.

In the beginning, no platform solution needs to come with all possible features the community will ever use - rather, try to identify what really counts for your community use case.

What would you like your members to be able to do on the platform? Which member behaviours would you like to observe, encourage and translate into your platform features?

To establish a foundational platform for a nascent community to encourage early engagement, focus on simplicity and scalability. From this engagement strategy and member requirements, easy structures and eventual features will follow.

Engagement

For any community platform, an early engagement strategy is essential to make it develop organically. The strategy elements can be translated into needed structures and features to make them a reality. *Why should the community members come to the platform?*

- Seed content:** Populate the platform with a few discussions and resources before launch.
- Invite key members:** Bring in early adopters to spark activity and serve as advocates.
- Community events:** Host a kickoff event and provide follow-up information.
- Encourage feedback:** Regularly ask for input on features or content.

Structures and Content

Navigation and entities

- Home and activity feed:** Central hub for highlights, news and main curated content
- Discussions:** Basic exchange structure with 2-3 initial topics
- Events:** A simple calendar for events or meetups.
- Members:** a searchable directory to connect.
- Resources library:** Limited repository for documents, links, or shared resources.

User roles and permissions

- Admins/ moderators:** Set up and manage the platform, monitor activity, and provide support.
- General members:** Basic access for all users.

Content

- Community mission and vision statement
- Quick-start guide for new members
- Community Guidelines
- ★ Thematic/ geographic community sub-groups
- Taxonomies on searchable content entities
- Collaborative files and content scheduling
- Video/ audio hosting and embedding
- Full-fledged event management and hosting

Features

- Member profiles:** Minimal profiles with name, bio, and interests and ideally taxonomies.
- Member directory:** A basic list of community members to foster networking, ideally identifiable via taxonomies.
- Multiple content types:** Simple forum or content with comment/like functionalities.
- Flexible dashboards:** to welcome community with curated information and login page.
- Notifications:** Alerts for replies, mentions, and announcements, can include newsletters.
- Feedback mechanism:** A form, poll, survey feature for collecting suggestions.

- ★ Customisable look & feel and groups
- Extended taxonomy management and spam prevention
- Ideation and sensemaking
- Gamification and badges
- Courses and certificates
- AI interfaces for knowledge synthesis, member matchmaking, moderation, Onboarding automation

Your Community Platform Governance

Design | Community Goals & Membership Engagement

GOALS

Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-Bound

For the 1 SMART objective of this year, **how will you engage** your members?
(online/offline/hybrid | content types | outreach public/ closed)

FEATURES

For member engagement, which **levels of permissions** do you need?
(authenticated-only/ verified/ ambassador & coordinator / CM | content types like files, videos, comments, posts, replies | rights like creating groups, inviting people, generate notifications)

✓ Do you have the **competences & resources** in place to do so?

Setup | User Verification & Content Moderation

TYPES & RIGHTS

Based on **which information** will you be able to **assign those permissions, how?**
(institutional mail, network knowledge | (de)centralised CM)

CONTENT

How do you **manage content** on the platform?
(individual CM, user reporting, automatic detection)

✓ Do you have the **competences & resources** in place to do so?

Application | Communications & Support

ONBOARDING

How do you **explain** your online community dynamics to your community membership?
(welcome page & process, newsletter, communications)

FACILITATE

How do you

- **collect necessary information** for verification?
- **onboard** future members & invite for activities?
- **apply** necessary actions?

✓ Do you have the **competences & resources** in place to do so?

Getting in touch with the EU

In person

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you online (european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/meet-us_en).

On the phone or in writing

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service:

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696,
- via the following form: european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/write-us_en.

Finding information about the EU

Online

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website (european-union.europa.eu).

EU publications

You can view or order EU publications at op.europa.eu/en/publications. Multiple copies of free publications can be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local documentation centre (european-union.europa.eu/contact-eu/meet-us_en).

EU law and related documents

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1951 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex (eur-lex.europa.eu).

EU open data

The portal data.europa.eu provides access to open datasets from the EU institutions, bodies and agencies. These can be downloaded and reused for free, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes. The portal also provides access to a wealth of datasets from European countries.

Science for policy

The Joint Research Centre (JRC) provides independent, evidence-based knowledge and science, supporting EU policies to positively impact society



EU Science Hub
[Joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu](https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu)



Publications Office
of the European Union