



SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
Priority 2.5.8
ICT for Networked Businesses

Project no: IST-034735

Project Acronym: **peardrop**

Project title: Promoting Ecosystems and Regional Development – in support of Regional Operational Programming

Instrument: Specific Support Action FP6

Thematic Priority: ICT for Networked Businesses

DELIVERABLE 2.5
“Report on the International Stakeholders Workshop I”

Due date of deliverable: June 2007

Actual submission date: July 2007

Start date of project: 01 September 2006

Duration: 24 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: eris@

Organisation name responsible for the internal review: EPMA

Revision: Draft

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	x
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Table of contents

1. Background information	3
2. Introduction	4
3. Scope of the workshop & invitation list	4
4. Summary of the presentations and related discussions	6
5. Final conclusions of the workshop	8
6. Concluding remarks	9
7. Reactions on the comments of the European Commission experts	9
Annex I - Agenda of the workshop	12
Annex II - Participant list	14
Annex III - peardrop's bulletins	16
Annex IV - Feedback questionnaire	17
Annex V - Signature list	20
Annex VI - Presentations of the day	21

1. Background information

As presented in **peardrop**'s description of work, during the lifespan of the project the project consortium has to organise three International Stakeholders Workshops (ISW).

Although all three workshops have common objectives (facilitating awareness raising and the exchange of experiences in the framework of Digital Business Ecosystem - DBE), each of them has specific and well defined aims.

In particular:

Workshop 1 (May 2007) - The specific purposes were to promote the results of Phase 1 of the project (especially the five initial draft Toolkits for the DBE sub-domains) and to develop a discussion on those with targeted key stakeholders. The expected outcome of the first workshop was to help 'signpost' for Phase 2 the kind of DBE deployment tools and models that stakeholders would consider as useful for them. In addition, the project aimed to use the discussion and feedback gained at the workshop to provide illustrative material for, and guide subsequent revisions of, the toolkit regarding the 5 DBE sub-domain topics addressed by the project.

Workshop 2 (February 2008) - The objective of this meeting will be to review the work in progress (M17), and especially the work relating to the identification of models, tools and systems in support of DBE deployment. Moreover, such an event aims at enabling an intensive exchange of experiences between regional representatives on best practices with respect to preparing their regional DBE deployment plans.

Workshop 3 (July - August 2008) – This will be the final **peardrop** workshop. It will take place in Brussels towards the end of the project (around M23). Here the aims will be (a) to promote the results of the project as widely as possible, especially the final Synthesis Guide & Toolkit for Regional DBE Deployment, (b) gain feedback on and promote the regional DBE deployment plans, and (c) to discuss and debate the way forward (road map) - especially **peardrop**'s proposals and recommendations for FP7, the Structural Funds, and other European policies (Lisbon, i2010, the CIP etc.). This roadmap will be included in D2.12 "Report on **peardrop**'s contribution to ERA Coordination Activities"

In relation to such objectives, different participants are invited to each event according to the specific aims to which it is dedicated. Please find below the details for each workshop.

Workshop 1 – Attendance by invitation only, representatives of the partner and focus group regions (total of 24), representatives of projects of the Digital Ecosystem (DE) Cluster, EC officials, members of the **peardrop** Advisory Group, and project partners.

Workshop 2 - For an invited audience only. It is intended to be a small, intensive work meeting between project partners, a small group of qualified experts and selected representatives of the partner and associated regions (12 in total). In addition, participation will be open to some projects of the DE Cluster, other DE 'practitioners', EC officials, and project partners.

Workshop 3 - This will be a more open event, although the specific participation of some key stakeholders will be invited (as for Workshop 2).

The table below presents the indicators to be considered for evaluating the attendance of the workshop.

Activity	Indicator	Target
International Stakeholder Workshop 1	Regions represented	20
International Stakeholder Workshop 1	Participants	45
International Stakeholder Workshop 2	Regions represented	12
International Stakeholder Workshop 2	Participants	40
International Stakeholder Workshop 3	Regions represented	25
International Stakeholder Workshop 3	Participants	60

The results of each workshop will be recorded in a report, to be submitted to the European Commission.

2. Introduction

The first workshop was organised in Brussels, on Tuesday 22nd May, 2007. The event took place in the premises of DG Information Society & Media, European Commission.

Prior to the meeting all participants were sent relevant background documents, namely:

- 5 Draft Toolkits (as at May 2007) that the **peardrop** project presented at the workshop
- The final agenda of the day
- The **peardrop** draft brochure

The workshop was chaired by Gareth Hughes, **peardrop**'s Project Manager, and was attended by 51 participants (see Annex V). At arrival, each participant was given an information package comprising:

- The Agenda for the meeting (attached as Annex I)
- The Attendees List (attached as Annex II)
- The 2 **peardrop** bulletins on Aragón and West Midlands (Annex III)

The First **peardrop** International Stakeholders Workshop was organised within the framework of the “*Third DE Concertation Meeting*”.

3. Scope of the workshop & invitation list

As mentioned above and in the invitations sent to the invited audience, the scope of this first **peardrop** International Stakeholders Workshop was two-fold:

- to present to regional stakeholders the concept of Digital Business Ecosystem (DBE) and, in particular, the benefits that regions can derive from the deployment of this new economic and technology paradigm;
- and to receive comments and suggestions regarding the first outputs of the project.

These two main objectives were achieved, respectively, through the definition of a well-structured agenda for the day and a follow-up action for the collection of feedback.

The agenda of the day was developed around presentations and discussions on:

- the key issues related to “Digital Business Ecosystems”;
- regional Digital Business Ecosystem success stories;
- **peardrop**'s 5 short Digital Business Ecosystem toolkits (each focusing on one of the five sub-domains: (i) DBE & Regional Economic Development; (ii) DBE Legal Issues; (iii) Financing DBE Deployment; (iv) DBE & SME Business Models; (v) DBE & Technical Support Platforms).

The collection of feedback on the event (as well as on the project outputs presented at the workshop) was conducted electronically. eris@ sent a simple questionnaire to all participants. Of the regions represented, 6 answered with useful comments and suggestions (see Annex IV, which provides a summary table of the answers collected).

As stated in the project description of work, attendance at the meeting was by invitation only. The consortium invited the following representatives:

- **peardrop** project partners (12);
- **peardrop** External Advisory Group (4 invites sent)
- EC Representatives/Officials (3 invites sent)
- EFFORT representative (2 invites sent)

- OPAALS NoE (3 invites sent)
- SEAMLESS representative (1 invite sent)
- LEGAL-IST representative (2 invites sent)
- LEKTOR representative (1 invite sent)
- Aragón Region (1 invite sent)
- West Midlands (1 invite sent)
- 24 Focus Group regions (40 invites sent)

The choice of the DE projects invited was based on the status of the project (ongoing/concluded) as well as on the type of collaboration that **peardrop** had had in the past or would like to have in the future. To be noted that eris@ made the effort to invite a representative from the **LEGAL-IST** project, namely Mr. Spindler in the first place and Mrs. Iglesias in a second attempt – but neither of them was able to attend. On the other side, of particular interest and usefulness was the attendance and the contribution from **OPAALS NoE** (namely Mr. Paolo Dini and Mr. Andrea Nicolai) and **LEKTOR** (Mrs. Margaretha Mazura and Yolanda Ursa) with whom **peardrop** will keep on building a strong collaboration.

17 of the 24 focus group regions that have accompanied the **peardrop** project during its first phase were able to send one or more representatives to Brussels to attend the workshop. This was notwithstanding the several invitations sent out addressing different contacts in each of the 24 focus group regions (as was the case of the Irish Regions to which up to 5 different people were invited, but with no-one able to attend in the end). This was mainly the result of the busy work schedule inevitable when trying to involve representatives holding senior positions.

The table below reports which of the Focus Group Regions sent a representative to the event.

					Attendance
eris@	Extremadura ✓	Valencia ✓	Malopolska ✓	Pomerania X	3
CSP	Piemonte ✓	Bolzano ✓	Emilia-Romagna ✓	Abruzzo X	3
AEC	Aquitaine ✓	Midi-Pyrenees X	Nord Pas de Calais ✓	Limousin X	2
TCH	Tampere ✓	Telmark (NO) ✓	Helsinki X	Lithuania ✓	3
CMI	Wales ✓	E. Midlands (UK) ✓	BMW (IR) X	Ireland X	2
EPMA	Vysocina ✓	Moravian-Silesia ✓	Pardubice ✓	Kosice ✓	4
TOTAL					17

The regional authorities of two of the **peardrop** partner regions (Vysocina and Tampere) asked the **peardrop** partners to represent them at the workshop. This was accepted given:

- the strong relationship and collaboration that each partner has with its own regional authority.
- the effort that partners made prior to the workshop to introduce the DBE concept and **peardrop** first outputs.

As indicated by the attached signature list (Annex V), the actual list of participants to the **peardrop** First International Stakeholders Workshop can be divided as follows:

- DE Project Representatives: 8
- European Commission Representatives: 9

- **peardrop** (partners and External Advisory Group): 16
- Focus Group Regional Representatives: 20

Please note that in this exercise we also consider those participants that were not included in the attendance list, namely: Yolanda Ursa, LEKTOR Project; Guido Acchioni, DG Information Society and Media, EC.

Travel and subsistence grants were at the disposal of those speakers and regional representatives needing financial support to participate to the workshop.

4. Summary of the presentations and related discussions

The workshop was opened by **Gerald Santucci**, Head of Unit, DG INFSO/D4, who welcomed the participants and introduced the scope of work of the Digital Ecosystem (DE) cluster. He touched on issues like the birth of the DBE concept, its current status and its potential. While emphasizing the importance of the DBE regional dimension, Gerald Santucci explained that DBE can be a facilitator between various stakeholders and that regional catalysts can use it to boost ICT uptake and accelerate economic growth.

Mr. Santucci's introduction was followed by a short introduction of the **peardrop** project by **Gareth Hughes**, Project Manager. In his presentation Gareth Hughes stressed the importance for the project for a validation of its first results by the participants in order to be able to further refine the toolkits for better use at regional level.

These two contextual introductions brought the participants closer to the central subject of the event: DBE. The DBE concept was presented by **Paolo Dini**, from the OPAALS Network of Excellence. Paolo Dini's presentation, quite a theoretical one, explained that DBE can be described as follows:

DBE = architecture + economic model + shared enterprise

He stressed the importance of the multidisciplinary approach that characterises DBE. In fact, DBE can be considered from a social sciences point of view, since it brings a change in social communication, or from a software engineering perspective, where it becomes a social process. In this context, Paolo Dini underlined that the strengths of DBE rely on its sustainability and democracy.

Concerning its maintenance, **Andrea Nicolai** explained that in a DBE the central actor is the DBE community itself. As for its governance, Andrea Nicolai explained that there is an emergence of groups of local communities that govern themselves. However, in a wider scope, the community has to decide how to govern a wider ecosystem, a European one for example.

These "theoretical" presentations were then followed by the introduction of two more practical regional experiences: from Aragón (Spain), by Javier Val, and from West Midlands (UK), by Rod Shelton.

Presenting the Aragón experience, **Javier Val** stated that one of the most positive benefits of the DBE deployment in Aragón has been the networking opportunities that have been created for enterprises. In fact, he suggested that DBE can enhance competitiveness and can allow enterprises to compete on an equal footing irrespective of their size. He also specified that in Aragón more than 6,000 SMEs are using DBE in one form or another.

Rod Shelton followed Javier Val and introduced the many differences of the implementations of DBE in Aragón and West Midlands. He explained that the main one is that the regional catalyst in Aragón was ICT policy makers in the region while in the West Midlands the regional catalyst was a higher education institution that was only an influencer of regional policy. Nevertheless, he added that both the regional catalysts adopted a similar approach in the DBE implementation process.

These introductory sessions were concluded with the collection of some questions. In particular, the delegates showed interest in the future steps that such regions are considering for maintaining DBE beyond the project funding (both regions have developed their DBE Pilot within the implementation of the DBE Integrated Project – FP6). Javier Val replied that in Aragón some key actions are being

undertaken at the regional level: 150,000€ had already been allocated to support DBE adoption for about 150 SMEs in 2007. Moreover, regional catalysts are also applying for different funding opportunities to improve the features of DBE architecture.

Following the coffee break, **peardrop** partners gave a short presentation of the first version of the 5 draft toolkits, each concerning a specific sub-domain related to the deployment of DBE.

- “Economic Impacts on Regional Development of DBE Deployment”
- “Business Models & Cultures of DBE Deployment”
- “Technology Infrastructure & Support Systems for DBE Deployment”
- “Financial Frameworks & Engineering on DBE Deployment”
- “Legal Issues & Challenges of DBE Deployment”

The afternoon session opened with the first reactions of the panellists on the usability by regions of the **peardrop** toolkits.

Aidan Roe, from the **peardrop** Advisory Group, noted that there is the need for simple and useful toolsets for DBE deployment that should be able to answer questions like: who is going to manage the new business models? In order to do so, he considered it useful to describe case studies and examples.

Marko Seppä from the **peardrop** Advisory Group, suggested not limiting the effort to the pushing of DBE into SMEs, since he considered it will be very difficult to achieve results in this way. He suggested stepping back to see how DBE can become a multi-faceted and a multi-capable system at regional level.

Elmar Husmann, from the **peardrop** Advisory Group, commented in particular on the DBE technical issues. He considered DBE as being a clever investment experiment for innovation. The most interesting feature, in his opinion, is the “distributed approach” of DBE. Elmar Husmann explained that DBE deals with 4 main technology trends: eBusiness, individual services over the Internet, information retrieval and open source development.

Margaretha Mazura, from the LEKTOR project, underlined that, in general, legal issues are considered only once they arise. For this reason the **peardrop** toolkit on DBE legal issues should, on the one hand, tackle the legal implications of DBE and, on the other, should be able to advise on which is the best regulatory environment for DBE development at regional level. The final aim will be to prevent the rise of such legal difficulties.

Simon Lavin, from the Welsh Assembly Government, explained that regional policy makers need to get greater confidence from the toolkits on what DBE is and on its benefits. For this, regions might need up and running examples to look at and more detail on how to implement DBE.

Ken Stockil, from the **peardrop** Advisory Group, recognised the difficulty to communicate and explain the DBE message and its benefits for regions. He stated that, if at this stage, benefits are intangible; **peardrop** toolkits should nonetheless try to explain such benefits. For this reason he advised including proposed demos. In addition, he underlined the centrality of the “User Perspective” to be considered when promoting DBE.

The intervention of the panel was followed by some questions and issues raised by the delegates.

Gareth Hughes asked to what extent **peardrop** should be “honest” when explaining the results of the first DBE pilots, its technological platform and the concept as a whole. There was no common answer, although most of the panellists suggested considering carefully each time, who is the audience.

Olivier Baudelet, from DG Regional Policy, EC, commented that SMEs are already engaged in various initiatives and therefore public money should be used to develop small pilots that can then move forward in a second stage. He added that DG Regional Policy does support experimentation on a small scale. On this, Marko Seppä commented that it would perhaps be useful to combine DBE, where there

is an ultimate objective, with Living Labs where there is a defined process but no final aim or concept to be deployed.

Michael Bryan, from East Midlands, UK, contributed to the discussion asking a series of central questions: what is the impact of DBE in the region? Can the tourism example be translated to other regions and sectors? He underlined the importance for regional politicians to understand what kind of DBE is possible to develop in their territory and what would be the costs related to it. To partially answer this question, Gareth Hughes suggested looking at the increase of GDP when a DBE is in place and what would be the (opportunity) cost, in the long term, of investing in old technology.

Irina Zálišová, from EPMA, added that a similar case scenario has been experienced in the development of eGovernment, where many regions are now obliged to catch up because of citizens' demand. In her opinion, DBE is suggesting the right middleware that could also be an opportunity to save money and move forward.

Elmar Husmann gave the opinion that public procurement in eGovernment could also represent a push for companies to take part in DBE.

Patrick Sullivan, from CMI, intervened to remind delegates that ICT has a positive influence on productivity and **peardrop** needs to deliver this message to the regions. He recalled that 20% of European productivity growth is attributed ICT exploitation (EU15 2000-2004). In this framework, DBE can directly contribute to these productivity gains and to the reduction of the gap between the EU and the USA.

The last contribution was given by Gareth Hughes on **peardrop**'s next steps (the process of selection of 12 Associated Regions for the next phase and future workshops).

The presentations of the day are available online, at the **peardrop** website (<http://www.peardrop.eu/Events.html>) as well as in the Third DE Concertation Meeting webpage (<http://www.digital-ecosystems.org/events/2007.05-fp6cluster/3cluster.html>)

5. Final conclusions of the workshop

Gareth Hughes concluded the workshop highlighting the following points:

- DBE State of the art technology is (almost) good enough, but it cannot be said that it is fully ready since some problems still exist (the development of the DBE platform is not concluded yet, in particular regarding the migration of content).
- DBE is indeed a technology for providing new services which can therefore contribute to regional development.
- There are different possibilities available for financing DBE deployment, especially if the different steps of deployment are taken separately.
- It is possible to develop DBE through an association of SMEs, which does not necessarily mean creating a new legal entity.
- It is important to clarify what happens with DBE when it is extended into several countries (i.e. cross-border implications).
- Other central issues related to DBE are the human resources: the skills and the labour relations between and within the DBE network/environment.
- Security is another important issue and a lot of questions arise on this issue and remain open.
- At regional level, DBE may be analysed in the wider context of “community building” (considering it as an element for social and political science), but its multidisciplinary approach should be definitely acknowledged.

For **peardrop** there is the need:

- to redefine, simplify and make the toolkits more user friendly (with similar layout and style).
- to consider the regional context specificities: e.g. to understand if a region deploys DBE as an adoption of eBusiness or for innovation purposes.
- for Toolkits, in general, to advise regions and give “practicalities” and suggest a roadmap for DBE implementation, not only explaining what the possible implications of DBE are.
- to use examples, to give end users a clearer idea and confidence in the subject.

6. Concluding remarks

peardrop's First International Workshop can be considered successful for the kind of attendance and the useful outcomes that it produced.

Checking the results and the outcomes against the indicators reported on page 3 it becomes clear that the 20 regional representatives and the total number of participants are in line with the expected indicators (namely: 20 regions represented & 45 participants).

Nevertheless, there are some lessons to be learned, as on every occasion.

The main ones that peardrop will keep in mind for next time are the following:

- find an attractive way to make sure participants do read the background documents before coming to the workshop.
- find a more creative approach to engage participants, to have them commenting and discussing: perhaps considering the split in smaller groups.
- make sure that the discussion and the presentations are more practical and closer to the participant's expectation.

7. Reactions on the comments of the European Commission experts

Following the comments of the European Commission reviewers (included in the report prepared by the European Commission on the **peardrop** First International Stakeholders' workshop), we include here some reactions for each of the comments/suggestions.

- *prior arrangements with the speakers to present information to match with the expectations of the participants;*
 - During the event this happened to be an issue in some cases, notwithstanding the details that were given to the speakers prior to the workshop. Moreover, all of them were requested to provide the organisers with their PPT at least a week prior to the event, which has been the case for most of them. The only PPT that the organisers were not able to see in advance (because of the decision of the speaker not to send it) was that relating to the introduction of the DBE concept.
- *allocation of extra time to discuss aspects interesting to the participants and to make provisions for active involvement in discussions;*
 - Indeed the whole afternoon of the event was dedicated to a discussion on the issues raised in the morning. The session was meant to be kicked off by the panellists and continued by the participants. The main problem that the organisers felt about this particular session was the absence of both regional speakers (Javier Val and Rod Shelton) that had agreed, prior to the meeting, to stay at least for the first couple of hours of the afternoon. For some reason, neither Javier Val, nor Rod Shelton stayed in the room for the event in the afternoon. Following the

meeting, we happen to know that Rod Shelton had been attending the REDEN meeting organised in parallel, in the same EC premises, in the same afternoon.

The organisers consider that the presence of those two representatives from the DBE pilot regions in the afternoon was essential for boosting the discussion.

- providing copies of presentations in advance;
→ This is a suggestion that the organisers will take on board for the organisation of the next workshop. The only concern is that speakers often make last minute changes in their PPT and this might create some confusion for the audience.
- planning the participation of regions well in advance and making provisions for alternatives in case the main participant is unable to attend;
→ Regions were informed about the workshop by partners from the beginning of April 2007. Formal invitations were sent out the first week of May and followed up by phone contacts by the relevant project partner. For the 24 regions, 40 invitations were sent (on average, two contacts for each region). In the invitation it was clearly stated that, in case the contacted person was not able to attend, he/she could pass the invitation to a colleague. In addition, when receiving a negative answer, the **peardrop** consortium invited the regional representative to send a substitute. **peardrop** also carefully made sure that the attendees represented the relevant regional actors that, in a further stage, could influence the decision to deploy DBE.
- timing of the workshop to be managed as there was a DE Cluster workshop happening at the same time which probably reduced the participation
→ The date for this first workshop was decided in mid-January 2007 and the European Commission was informed at the beginning of February 2007. At that stage the Commission launched the first round of consultation for deciding the date of the 3rd DE Cluster Meeting. For timing reasons, the **peardrop** consortium felt it useful to keep its workshop at the already-decided date, and clearly informed the EC about its intentions (in a mail addressed to Marion Le Louarn on February 14, 2007).

Based on this it is recommended that the 2nd workshop:

- will be planned in advance with objectives made clear to speakers well in advance as this will help in better preparation by the speakers and also to provide quality presentations to the participants
→ The date for the next workshop has already been agreed: 7-8th February 2008 (venue to be announced). This date has already been included in the communications sent to the **peardrop** focus group regions as well as in the Memorandum of Collaboration that some of them will be signing to become associated regions, in **peardrop**'s second phase.
- making sure the timing of the workshop is better planned and does not clash with other similar events to ensure quality participation
→ This suggestion will be taken seriously. In particular, the organisation will make sure (as far as possible) that no other relevant meeting will be organised/planned in parallel.
- the toolkit will be sent in advance with a one page questionnaire to provide feedback
→ This suggestion is very useful, in particular considering the question form (for the first workshop the toolkits were sent a week in advance to the participants). Such activity could in fact push the participants to get more involved in the event.
- the printouts of the presentations/speeches will be provided during the workshop registration
→ This comment is taken on board and every effort will be made to achieve it.
- allocate adequate discussion times to make sure the participants are continuously involved and aspects interesting to them are always on focus

- Comment is taken on board
- *in case language issues are felt to be present, to make arrangements for translators to help all participants to engage in discussions*
 - The suggestion is indeed pointing out a relevant issue. Nevertheless, it will be impossible for **peardrop** to be able to offer such services for various reasons, mainly:
 - limitation of the budget;
 - the number of languages to be covered (at least 5)

Annex I - Agenda of the workshop

“First Digital Business Ecosystem International Stakeholders Workshop”

“Digital Business Ecosystem: an opportunity for regional development”

Date: Tuesday 22nd of May 2007

European Commission, Avenue de Beaulieu 25, Room 0/S1, Brussels

The aim of this first peardrop International Stakeholders Workshop is to present to regional stakeholders the concept of Digital Business Ecosystem and, in particular, the benefits that regions can take from the deployment of such new economic environment.

This will be done through the presentation and discussion on:

- ✓ regional Digital Business Ecosystem success stories;
- ✓ **peardrop**'s 5 short Digital Business Ecosystem toolkits on issues like:
 - DBE & regional economic development;
 - DBE & legal issues;
 - Financing DBE deployment;
 - DBE & regional business models;
 - DBE & technical systems;
- ✓ the key issues related to “Digital Business Ecosystems”

...and much more!

Do not miss this opportunity to better understand how the Digital Business Ecosystem can support the economic and social development of your region!

For more information:

Silvia Favret, eris@ office

Tel: +32 2 230 03 25

Fax: +32 2 230 92 01

E-mail: Silvia.Favret@erisa.be

URL www.peardrop.eu

The acronym **peardrop** stands for “**Promoting Ecosystems And Regional Development in support of Regional Operational Programming**”.

It is a Specific Support Action (SSA) under the strategic objective 2.5.8 ICT for Networked Businesses with a view to clarifying, disseminating and promoting the results of regional deployments of innovative ecosystem and SMEs cluster models.

In a few lines, its principal focus is to make more accessible and more practicable for regional policy makers and key local actors the instruments for exploitation and adoption of new innovative business paradigms in ICT for Enterprise Networking.

The event is organized by 

Agenda

- 08:45 – 09:30 **Registration**
- 09:30 – 09:45 **Welcome & Introduction**
Gérald Santucci, Head of Unit "Networked Enterprises & Radio Frequency Identification", DG Information Society & Media, EC
- 09:45 – 10:00 **Introduction to the peardrop project**
Gareth Hughes, peardrop Project Manager, CEO eris@
- 10:00 – 10:20 **Introduction to the DBE concept**
Paolo Dini, OPAALS Project Coordinator
- 10:20 – 10:40 **Aragón regional DBE Experience**
Javier Val, Technological Institute of Aragón, Spain
- 10:40 – 11:00 **West Midlands regional DBE Experience**
Rod Shelton, University of Central England, West Midlands, United Kingdom
- 11:00 – 11:20 **Question & Answer Session**
- 11:20 – 11:45 *Coffee Break*
- 11:45 – 13:00 **peardrop Digital Business Ecosystem Toolkits**
Introduction by **Gareth Hughes**, peardrop Project Manager
“Economic Impacts on Regional Development of DBE deployment”
Claudio Inguaggiato, CSP “*Innovazione nelle ICT*”, Piedmont, Italy
“Business Models & Cultures of DBE deployments”
Patrick Sullivan, CMI International
“Technology Infrastructure & Support Systems for DBE deployments”
Manu Setälä, Technology Center Hermia, Tampere, Finland
“Financial Frameworks & Engineering of DBE deployments”
Irina Zálišová, European Projects & Management Agency, Vysocina, Czech Republic
“Legal Issues & Challenges of DBE deployments”
François Gilbert, *Aquitaine Europe Communication*, Aquitaine, France
- 13:00 – 14:30 *Lunch Break*
- 14:30 – 15:30 **Panel discussion on the usability for regions of peardrop DBE Toolkits**
Chaired by **Gareth Hughes**, Project Manager
Aidan Roe, peardrop Advisory Group Member
Elmar Husmann, peardrop Advisory Group Member
Ken Stockil, peardrop Advisory Group Member
Marko Seppä, peardrop Advisory Group Member
Simon Lavin, Welsh Government Assembly, UK
Margaretha Mazura, LEKTOR Project
- 15:30 – 16:30 **Open Debate & Discussion**
Chaired by **Gareth Hughes**, with participation of regions, panel experts & speakers
- 16:30 – 16:45 **Participation of regions**
Gareth Hughes, peardrop Project Manager
 ✓ Identification of peardrop Associated Regions
 ✓ Second International Stakeholders Workshop
- 16:45 – 17:00 **Conclusions of the day**
Gareth Hughes, peardrop Project Manager
- 17:00 **Close of the Meeting**

Annex II - Participant list



peardrop Promoting Business Ecosystems
 First International Workshop
 "Digital Business Ecosystem: an opportunity for regional development"



Name	Last name	Job Title	Organization/Region	Email Address
Olivier	BAUDELET	Administrator	DG REGIO, 'Territorial cooperation Unit'	olivier.baudilet@ec.europa.eu
Tor-Anne	BELLIKA	Innovation Manager	IKT GREENLAND, Telemark Region, Norway	tab@i-perform.no
Elena	BENSI	Project Manager	TIS/DIGILAB Province of Boziano, Italy	elena.bensi@digilab.bz
Flavio	BONFATTI	Professor Modena & Reggio Emilia University	SEAMLESS Project	flavio.bonfatti@unimore.it
Michael	BRYAN	Policy Adviser	East Midlands European Office (EMEO)	michaeb@eastmidlands.europa.org
Olivier	CHARRIER	Project Manager	Nord Pas de Calais Regional Government, France	o.charrier@cr-npdc.fr
Frank	CUNNINGHAM	Administrator	DG INFSO, Evaluation and Monitoring	Frank.Cunningham@ec.europa.eu
Keri-Anne	DAVIES	eBusiness Adviser	Welsh Assembly Government, United Kingdom	keri-anne.davies@wales.gsi.gov.uk
Paolo	DINI	Senior Research Fellow	OPAAALS, London School of Economics	p.dini@lse.ac.uk
Maino	FARIAS	Project Manager	TIS/DIGILAB Province of Boziano, Italy	mario.farias@digilab.bz
Silvia	FAVRET	Project Assistant	peardrop project, eris@	silvia.favret@erisa.be
Michela	GARBARINI	Project Assistant	peardrop project, CSP	michela.garbarini@csp.it
François	GILBERT	Deputy Director	peardrop project, AEC	francois.gilbert@aecom.org
Nigel	GRADDON	Planning and Development Manager	Welsh Assembly Government, United Kingdom	nigel.graddon@wales.gsi.gov.uk
Gareth	HUGHES	Project Manager	peardrop project, eris@	ghughes@nisi.u-net.com
Eimar	HUSMANN	Global Business Services - Strategy & Change Managing Consultant	peardrop External Advisory Group	huselmar@de.ibm.com
Claudio	INGUAGGIATO	Director	peardrop project, CSP	claudio.inguaggiato@csp.it
Lenka	JURKOVA	Head of the Liaison Office	Košice Region	jurkova.lenka@kosice.regionet.sk
Austra	KUMETAITIENE	Head of Division- Electronic Services & Innovation	ISDC, Lithuania Government	a.kumetaitiene@ivpk.lt
Margarita	LAGO	Project Officer	DG INFSO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	Margarita.Lago@ec.europa.eu
Simon	LAVIN	Planning & Development Support Manager	Welsh Assembly Government, United Kingdom	simon.lavin@wales.gsi.gov.uk
Manon	LE LOUARN	Administrator	DG INFSO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	Manon.Le-Louarn@ec.europa.eu
Karolina N.	LIPINSKA	Project Manager	Pomerania Region, Poland	karolina.lipinska@arp.gda.pl
Rita	MALAVASI	Policy Officer	Regione Emilia Romagna	rita.malavasi@opinet.be
Carolina	MARCO BELLVER	European Affairs Officer	Valencia Regional Government, Spain	marco_carbell@gva.es
Jan	MATUCHA	Project Assistant	peardrop project, EPMA	matucha@epma.cz





First International Workshop
"Digital Business Ecosystem: an opportunity for regional development"



Name	Last name	Job Title	Organization/Region	Email Address
Sophie	MAVOR	Consultant	peardrop project, CMI	s.mavor@cm-intl.com
Margaretha	MAZURA	Deputy Secretary General EMF	LEKTOR Project, EMF	mim@e-multimedia.org
Tim	MILLER	Director	EMNET, East Midlands, United Kingdom	T.Miller@emnet.co.uk
Francesco	MACHIRA	Head of Section	DG INFSO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	Francesco.Machira@ec.europa.eu
Andrea	NICOLAI	CEO and Founder of T6	OPAALS NoE, T6 Italy	a.nicolai@t-6.it
Ilona	OBRŠÁLOVÁ	Vice-Dean of Faculty	University of Pardubice, Czech Republic	Ilona.Obrsalova@upce.cz
Rosemary	O'CONNOR	Office Director	peardrop project, CMI	r.oconnor@cm-intl.ie
Eoghan	O'NEILL	Scientific Officer	DG INFSO, Policy Link	eoghan.o'neill@ec.europa.eu
Miguel Angel	PEREZ	Expert in Electronics	Aragon Technological Institute, Spain	mperez@ita.es
Leonardo	PICINETTI	R&D Innovation Officer	Emilia Romagna Region, Italy	l.picinetti@gmail.com
Agnieszka	POLARSKA	Unit Manager	Marshal Office of the Malopolska Region, Poland	apol@malopolska.mw.gov.pl
Florence	PUNZANO	Regional Officer	Aquitaine Regional Government, France	info@bureau-aquitaine.be
Rivera	RIVERA LEÓN (T6)	Consultant	T6, Italy	lorena.rivera-leon@t-6.it
Gloria	RODRIGUEZ PINA	Head of R&D Department	FUNDECYT, Extremadura, Spain	gloria.rodriguez@fundecyt.es
Aidan	ROE	Lead Consultant	peardrop External Advisory Group	aidan@itemassociates.com
Gerald	SANTUCCI	Head of Unit	DG INFSO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	gerald.santucci@ec.europa.eu
Nagaraj	SEETHARAMON KONDA	Medici Fellow, Knowledge & Technology Research Group	University of Central England, United Kingdom	Nagaraj.Seetharamon.Konda@uce.ac.uk
Marko	SEPPÄ	Professor Growth Venturing, Jyväskylä University	peardrop External Advisory Group	marko.seppa@tut.fi
Manu	SETÁLÁ	Senior Adviser	peardrop project, TCH	manu.setala@tch.fi
Rod	SHELTON	Senior Lecturer in Management	University of Central England, West Midlands	Rod.Shelton@uce.ac.uk
Anna	SIBILLA	RTD officer	Piedmont Region, Italy	anna.sibilla@unioncamerapiemonte.be
Ken	STOCKIL	Director of Innovation Exchange	peardrop External Advisory Group	ken@innovationexchange.ie
Patrick	SULLIVAN	Office Director	peardrop project, CMI	p.sullivan@cm-intl.ie
Jifi	TOMČIK	Project Manager	Moravian Silesian Region, Czech Republic	jtomcik@msunion.cz
Ester	TORRES	Association Manager	peardrop project, eris@	ester.torres@erisa.be
Nicola	TRUDU	Trainee	peardrop project, eris@	nicola.trudu@erisa.be
Javier	VAL	Project Administrator	Aragon Technological Institute, Spain	jval@ita.es
Irina	ZALIŠOVÁ	Director	peardrop project, EPMA	zalisova@epma.cz



Annex III - peardrop's bulletins

PEARDROP Bulletin n°2
December 2006

BUSINESS ECOSYSTEMS BULLETIN

PEARDROP interviews...

Dr. Javier VAL

DBE Project Administrator, Technological Institute of Aragon, Spain

The Technological Institute of Aragon (ITA) is one of the three pilot "regional catalysts" taking part in the Digital Business Ecosystems Integrated Project of regional catalysts coordinating regional training and community building activities in their region on a specific topic. Its main aim is to activate other potential partners and influencers, identify driver and discoverer SMEs and coordinate between these main regional actors. They thereby catalyze the process of regional DBE community building.

1. Aragon is one of the regional catalysts of the Digital Business Ecosystem (DBE). In a few words, from a regional perspective, how would you define a DBE?
The Digital Business Ecosystem (DBE) is an Internet-based software environment in which business applications can be developed and used. The unique feature of the DBE is that applications within the ecosystem are able to perform new functions that were, up to now, unachievable by users.

The DBE is an open, free environment where even the smallest specialist software developer can participate competently in the massive global marketplace for business applications. It will enable end users to easily access and use these applications as services, and to take the benefits of intelligence, information and adaptation as the software evolves in response to their own usage and that of others. The initial target of the DBE is those complex commercial transactions and processes that are not easily or economically served by current, even state-of-the-art, software technologies (these information can be found at www.digital-ecosystem.org).

2. What has it meant to be a regional catalyst within the DBE Project? What has Aragon done?
As in a chemical reaction, the catalyst facilitates the reaction and the mix of different components. The initial target of ITA, explanation is to introduce DBE technology in the region, providing all the support needed to achieve it.

The DBE technology is a middleware which may be applied to initiate business cases and sectors. However, to be as efficient as possible in the beginning, it was decided to concentrate the effort in one specific sector. Following a deep consultancy study, ITA chose the Aragon tourism sector for reasons like (i) it is non-structured and composed mainly by SMEs who struggle to compete with big tour operators, (ii) it represents an important part of the GDP, mainly in the rural areas of the region, (iii) it did not have an already mature system (that would have limited their participation in the DBE pilot), (iv) it responded to DBE needs for a high number of transactions among the different participating agents, as well as an balance of interest among them (with a clear "tourism" actor).

3. Which are the main actors that can support the DBE engagement process in the Aragon region?

ITA detected 4 main "agent" profiles in the region, for which have been defined specific collaboration objectives and actions. These are:

The Regional Catalyst: that aims at the deployment of a DBE platform in the region and "checks" the pilot concepts, coordinating all the recruitment and training activities.

Software Developer SMEs: with high experience in the sector which have already developed tourism applications and deployed them in real user SMEs. These SMEs are the first agents that have to understand the DBE concepts and the potential of the technology.

User SMEs: in the tourism sector. In Aragon's case, these are already Software Developer SMEs customers and therefore are already using their software applications in a real background. In this way, the learning curve is minimized and the project processes optimized.

Lastly, the **Influencers:** represented by the political agents and the advisors which take the most important decisions in the region. Indeed, once the project is proposed to the Software Developer SMEs and User SMEs, then they request for recommendation to their influencers. Then, if those influencers are already aware of the project and have already a positive view of it, then the hope is closed and the success of the project is guaranteed.

4. What is the bootstrap strategy and the DBE engagement process in the Aragon region?

The main chain of activities that ITA has done for the bootstrapping are:

• A survey of all regional IST SMEs (which are segmented).

• The search for support from main regional political agents.

• The organization of a one day workshop to present the project with the support of the Government attended by the main Software Developer SMEs of the region.

• Personal interviews with the interested SMEs in order to clarify key concepts and, even more important, to structure the work plan and the activities that those companies will have to execute if participating in the project.

In particular, the **management of the Software Developer SMEs** was carried out in three phases because of reasons like the first SMEs groups contribute towards a more robust platform (e.g. suggesting how to improve the architecture).

Project name: "Promoting Ecosystems and Regional Development in support of Regional Operational Programming".
Policy Domain: Regional Development, Innovation Policy and Networks, Digital Business Ecosystem (DBE), eBusiness.
Regional Interest: This movement among regional stakeholders on the specific policy domains. In particular from a group of regions in the field of DBE deployment and ICT for Business Networking.

For more information: write 13, Rue de Paris, 53000 Sarlat-la-Canéda, France. Tel: +33 2 330 92 05 Fax: +33 2 330 92 01 peardrop@ista.be www.peardrop.eu (to be released)

PEARDROP interviews Mr. Javier VAL, DBE Project Administrator, Aragon Spain

ture), the second group tested the feedback collected by the first group of SMEs and the third one helps checking the robustness and usability of the platform.

At the time this document is written:

• the first group of SW Developer SMEs (4) has already finished their development. User SMEs (11) that are going to integrate in the project have already signed an agreement of participation. They are going to install the software solutions in the following weeks. Some new features have also been added to the existing applications so to guarantee their easy and fast integration in the DBE platform. Thanks to the DBE, it has been possible to integrate in real time different technologies: some far from the state-of-art (COBOL, Visual Basic) others in the state-of the art (J2EE).

• the second group of SW Developer SMEs (8) are working on their developments. They have already defined what they are going to implement and each of them has already selected at least 2 User SMEs.

• the third group SW Developer SMEs (12), that has just started its work, has already defined what they will implement and selected 2 User SMEs each. This group comprises SW Developer SMEs active in different sectors, not only the tourism one.

At the end of this project, the Aragon Region is expected to have more than 30 Software Developer SMEs and more than 100 User SMEs involved in the DBE deployment process.

5. Can you explain how this new "Business Paradigm" influences positively the economic development and growth of a region? Can you report any concrete results from Aragon's experience?

DBE is interesting for its innovative technological concepts, not from a political perspective, for the international visibility that it offers to regional and local SMEs. DBE is an opportunity to make SMEs more competitive since, through it, they can enter a top-level system of "dynamic" "ecosystems" allows them to meet other SMEs, "Competitor/Agents" without any previous contact or knowledge of their existence. All of this is possible because DBE gives the possibility to describe concepts in a semantic way, thanks to the provision of services and products. This dynamism provided by DBE can also improve the local-national-international networking, a factor that has been proved to increase productivity in some countries in Europe. At the same time, the project attracts the regional IST SMEs since, on one side, it helps the deployment of technical solutions to find user SMEs (in an open access background with regard to the big companies in the sector); on the other side, the DBE Project offers the opportunity to participate in an international strategic project supported by the EU.

As detailed in the previous answer, there are already 24 SW Developer SMEs working around the DBE network. Since we have made them work together since the beginning, holding common meetings, etc, now they know each other and understand, some of them have started to do business together. Let's say that DBE has created the "ecosystem" for the network.

Thanks to the success of the DBE experiment in the Aragon region, we are now disseminating the results at a national level. I could provide several examples... but this arti-

cle is already a very good one!

6. Would you recommend to other regions to "become" regional catalysts of the DBE model? Can you give us some reasons why they should think about it?

Certainly! I would strongly recommend it! The more regions are in, the more SMEs will be part of the ecosystem and the more advanced SMEs will be! The DBE platform not only allows SMEs to make business in a more productive way, it also "shows" to participating SMEs the new ways of doing business.

Moreover, the advantages we have seen in Aragon could be easily applicable to other regions.

7. We understand that there are some true benefits that regions can gain when helping their SMEs to participate in such "ecosystems". Is there a particular "key factor" to which regional policy makers should pay attention? In other words, should they have a particular "optimal situation" to be able to deploy DBE?

The three different regions which have participated as regional catalyst in the project (Aragon, Central England and Aragon) have followed a common general strategy, but have chosen different way of implementing it in some points. These approaches have produced very interesting conclusions on what has worked and what has not worked.

For example, we discovered that a DBE pilot region needs a regional catalyst able to coordinate and to provide technical support and training to the Software Developer SMEs. Afterwards, once there are more regions joining the system, together with a big community, that technical support in the network will be provided by the community itself.

Depending on the culture and background of the region, technical support is also an important point, since a SME that intends to start working in a new technology is often not able to make a complete strategic study by itself, therefore it will prefer to ask for the government's opinion and support.

Today's, new regions will be able to find very good sustainable business ideas which have been generated within the DBE project, therefore, their effort in that sense will be less demanding. What is central is to select the optimum starting sector and concentrate all first efforts, as I explained before.

8. As you know PEARDROP is an EU funded project that aims at Promoting Ecosystems and Regional Development in support of Regional Operational Programming. In your opinion, which way should PEARDROP help regions in the implementation of ICT Business Networking and DBE?

The strategy followed by the Aragon region has been successful. It would be interesting to try to apply it in other regions following the step-by-step actions and adapting to the concrete background of the particular region. It would be interesting to identify the different "ecosystem" agents in the region, provide them with a concrete name and make them start working!

GOBIERNO DE ARAGON
Junta Aragonesa de Gobierno
Mr. Javier VAL
jval@ista.es

More info on Aragon's experience: www.ista.es
A demo video is also available at: www.ista.es/01-034

PEARDROP Bulletin n°1
November 2006

BUSINESS ECOSYSTEMS BULLETIN

PEARDROP interviews...



Project name: "Promoting Ecosystems and Regional Development in support of Regional Operational Programming".

Policy Domain: Regional Development, Innovation Policy and Networks, Digital Business Ecosystem (DBE), eBusiness.

Regional Interest: raise awareness among regional stakeholders on the specific policy domains. In particular form group of regions in the field of DBE deployment and ICT for Business Networking. It will do so:

- By presenting to regional stakeholders the key **INFORMATION & TECHNICAL TOOLS** on innovative business paradigms already developed by other EU funded projects, comprising the brand new DBE Technological Platform.
- Through its "Guides & Toolkits": light clear documents that will help you finding the best **METHODOLOGY** for deploying DBE and ICT Business Networking in your territory.
- In its **EVENTS**: valuable perfect occasions to meet **SPECIALISTS**, many other interested regions, and discuss how to implement DBE!

For more information
Silvia Favari, email: efavari@ista.be
13, Rue de Paris, 53100 Sarlat-la-Canéda
Phone: +33 2 330 92 05 Fax: +33 2 330 92 01
E-Mail: peardrop@ista.be
URL: www.peardrop.eu (to be released)



PEARDROP is a specific project within DBE (Digital Business Ecosystems) supported by the European Union in the framework of the European Union's Regional Development Policy (ERDF) for Economic & Technological Development.

Dr. Rod SHELTON

Project Director DBE Project, University of Central England (UK)

The University of Central England (UCE) is one of three pilot "regional catalysts" taking part in the Digital Business Ecosystem Integrated Project.

A "regional catalyst" coordinates regional training and community building activities in their region on a specific topic. Its main aim is to activate other potential partners and influencers, identify driver and discoverer SMEs and coordinate between these main regional actors. They thereby catalyze the process of regional DBE community building.

1. The University of Central England (Birmingham) is one of the regional catalysts of the Digital Business Ecosystem (DBE). What have been the activities that you have undertaken within the DBE Project?

We have been concerned with designing ways of linking SMEs with the project partners. This has involved defining and identifying the characteristics of suitable SMEs of different kinds to join the DBE project helping SMEs to gain an awareness of the project (in terms, processes, structures and requirements) orienting them to the project. We also helped them to develop their software services to be included in the DBE architecture and used ultimately as web-based peer-to-peer services. Each of our team has propelled the DBE into some productive directions. For example Stuart Kerski, Dr Victor Bayon and Peter Sharbridge have together created some influential ideas about new business models and networks. Mike Wardell and Dave Smith have supported SME developments and the sustainability of the DBE enterprise after the project phase.

2. It has been said that the DBE "business paradigm" can influence positively the economic development and growth of a region. Can you report any concrete results from your regional experience?

At this stage we would offer the level of interest and adoption of our suggestions by regional policy makers in development agencies and large companies as some indication of the economic potential of the DBE, but its tangible impact is as yet unclear. Nevertheless, the fact that policy makers have given space and time to discussion of DBE and are considering their own significant investments in future versions of it, are measures of its success and future growth potential-but as yet it is too early for quantitative impact. e.g. increased investment, more companies, services or jobs. We have also had some significant investments in future versions of it, are measures of its success and future growth potential"

least hold the prospect of some other latent SME networks forming to enhance innovation speed and quality.

3. Together with Dr. Nagaraj Konda, Dr. Victor Bayon and Dr. Lynn

PEARDROP interviews Dr. Rod Shelton Project Director DBE Project University of Central England (UK)

Merrie you have generated a paper titled "Regional catalysts: developing a digital ecosystem" in which you have analysed your approach to the regional catalyst role in the project phase of the DBE. A natural comprehensive assessment of regional characteristics and needs would, as the Centre team with Antonella Pansini have shown, perhaps enable a regional decision maker to choose a specific catalyst who most closely fitted the requirements of that region. Full time specialist agencies, with permanent funding and staff with expertise, government support and investment, and the enthusiasm of a community such as open source software developers in a region, would seem to stand a better chance of success than an ad hoc organization such as a business school. We agree that familiarity with the local IT strategy over a long period of time would provide influence over investments in DBE and therefore speed up the absorption of the project in the region. However, it is interesting and worthwhile to see the "realism" that can occur when an ad hoc organization acts outside its initial role as regional catalyst and takes on the responsibility of its own success or failure. It may well be that the responses to forced limitations in the end set to transform catalysts and attract new resources of all kinds.

4. In the light of your experience, would you recommend to other regions to "become" regional catalysts for the DBE model? Can you give us some reasons why they should think about it?

The enactment of the DBE is a great attractor and one that outweighs the difficulties. The excitement of the DBE is a great attractor and one that outweighs the difficulties. The excitement of the DBE is a great attractor and one that outweighs the difficulties.

5. We understand that there are some true benefits that regions can gain when helping their SMEs to participate in such "ecosystems". Can we say that all European regions could decide to apply the DBE model in their territory, despite the economic and social differences that characterize EU regions?

The regions in effect favour this statement by applying to participate with the DBE, and there have been sufficient of these to suggest that the DBE could be universal. However, this may be subject to interpreting a sequence and it may be partial i.e. not all regions might do all the DBE. One factor is consistency of areas of trust, security, and reliability and how some regions may not have the necessary infrastructure. We do not

have the data to support this really.

6. As you know, PEARDROP is a EU funded Specific Support Action that aims at Promoting Ecosystems and Regional Development in support of Regional Operational Programming. If you would had to make a recommendation to this study, how project, what would you recommend?

Bring a representative group of people together at the start of the project and create an evaluation panel from them who will track and assess the project throughout. Include SME owners and local policy makers, representatives of big companies in the group. Do not over-specify the project in advance of needs and requirements emerging from the field. Do not pressure to regions or SMEs what they need - let them design and discover this themselves.

Dr-Rod Shelton
Rod.Shelton@uce.ac.uk
Ferry Bar-Birmingham
B42 2SU, England, UK
www.uce.ac.uk



More info on Aragon's experience: www.ista.es
A demo video is also available at: www.ista.es/01-034

Annex IV - Feedback questionnaire

TOOLKITS all toolkits are available at: <http://www.peardrop.eu/Ourworks.html>

Please note that these 5 draft toolkits, at this stage, are meant to explain the DBE concept from different perspectives; in the coming months **peardrop** will develop a step by step "tool" for DBE deployment.

"DBE as a model for local development"	Bonifatti (SEAMLESS)	Extremadura Region	IKT Grenland Region	Malopolska Region	Pardubice Region	Wales Region
Was this toolkit understandable?	Yes, although it is quite generic.	Yes, it was	Not very	Yes, it was.	The text is understandable. It clearly describes a DBE model, its impacts on local development, economic impact and policy implication. For clearness, text is coupled with a model scheme.	The principles outlined within the toolkit were understandable; however it was difficult to understand how these can be applied to businesses (SMEs) within our local regions. Much of the information does not go into enough detail and I would be hesitant in speaking to SMEs about DBEs at present as the information within the toolkits is limited.
Was this toolkit usable & well structured?	Well structured. But not really convincing my personal contacts.	Yes	Well structured, but not particularly usable- lacks a naming of target group(s) and mode/situation of usage on front page.	Yes, it was.	The text is well structured and usable because of serving basic information about the project. The toolkit can help regions with preparation in the field of Digital Business Ecosystems implementation.	I would not yet describe the information we were given as a 'toolkit'. The information was well structured but at this point in time, it can only be used as an Introduction to the DBE concept. I imagine a DBE toolkit to be a product which can provide me with everything I need to allow me to create or to become part of a Digital Business Ecosystem, by following step by step guides etc. This is not currently possible.
1st idea on how to improve it	Maybe, present real successful cases involving real SMEs.	A concrete example of a DBE system, even if fictional, developed as a case study through the "DBE as a model for local development" chapter of the toolkit could be useful to picture what exactly a DBE is. At the workshop last 22 nd May, both the presentations from Aragón and West Midlands were essential to have a better understanding of what DBEs are in reality.	Use Graphics – the maturity model from Web-site very early in the document.	There is a small mistake in the table: there is twice "Widespread entrepreneurship and international competitiveness" instead of "Increasing cooperation".	The Digital Business Ecosystem model involves some key players including „Regional Catalysts" and Public Authorities. It would be useful to define the role of education institutions (including universities) in the system.	Creation of materials which can be presented to businesses to explain and promote Digital Business Ecosystems. This should include real case study examples (and if these have not yet been developed, then imaginary companies should be used to illustrate the concept of a DBE). Also interviews with businesses that have benefited from being part of a DBE would be beneficial.
2nd idea on how to improve it			State target group of readers and purpose/goals for the target reader		Data safety is a significant aspect of each system. On that ground, data transfer security between participants and the centre could be better conducted.	Step by step guides could be developed which explain the full process of becoming part of a DBE. These processes may be different for each industry and/or business sector and the guides should highlight this. Finally, Flow Diagrams of the processes and frequently asked questions should be included.
Was this toolkit understandable?	Yes, although it is quite generic.	Yes	Yes	Yes, it was.	The text as a Legal Guide for DBE deployment in regions deals juridical aspects of DBE implementation in the European countries. The toolkit is understandable due to not only text, but also scheme.	The toolkit was understandable but it seems that a lot of issues have not yet been completely resolved concerning the legal issues of DBEs.
Was this toolkit usable & well structured?	Well structured. Usable (and useful) since it deals with a subject that is not sufficiently known.	Yes, but it could be supported with a summary table.	Yes	Yes, it was.	The toolkit is usable, because it has taken into account various European legal systems. As far as structure, the list of legal regulations (governing this problem) misses.	The structure and usability was fairly adequate, however, it would depend on who the target audience is going to be. If a business was to use the toolkit they would require more detail.

“Legal Issues for DBE deployment in regions”	Bonifatti (SEAMLESS)	Extremadura Region	IKT Grenland Region	Malopolska Region	Pardubice Region	Wales Region
1st idea on how to improve it	Maybe, present real successful cases involving real SMEs.	The “What are the main arguments to convince local political decision makers” chapter could be more convincing if the benefits listed included more general issues, instead of focusing so much on DBE related aspects. It is about convincing them to deploy something in theory completely new for them, so it could be useful to include as well other benefits or impacts on the economic/entrepreneurship development of the region as a whole.	Graphics and design- it really need a better visual profile	The subchapter “Public funding: How can a region help the creation of a DBE” does not exist on the main picture as the other six subchapters. So I suggest to place it as first using different font or to join it to “Rules of existence, structure and capital”	The peardrop project, in its legal part, has taken into account all various European systems when planning the installation of a DBE. It is necessary to specify individual legal variants in more detail.	I believe that businesses would be seeking more detailed answers to many other questions (concerning liability issues for example) which the toolkit does not yet explain fully. It would be useful to speak to businesses currently working within DBEs and include an FAQ section within the toolkit outlining important legal issues (in the form of questions) which many businesses are concerned with.
2nd idea on how to improve it		Links to where to find more information on EACH of the articles of laws and treaties mentioned on “What are the legal elements to taken into account in a DBE” chapter would be very useful. Other than the diagram included in this chapter, a table summarising all these could help having a clearer picture.	More illustrations	The abbreviations are not always evident. It would be maybe better if they were cleared when first used.	It would be also very useful to define role and cognizance of supranational bodies in the field of disputes agenda if any between institutions.	

“DBE technology infrastructure and support systems”	Bonifatti (SEAMLESS)	Extremadura Region	IKT Grenland Region	Malopolska Region	Pardubice Region	Wales Region
Was this toolkit understandable?	Not really. The DBE technology is still missing a simple organic view (it is presented as a list of parts not clearly related to each other).	Generally yes	Yes	Yes, it was.	This toolkit is understandable particularly for IT specialists. On the contrary this toolkit is not well understandable for those who are not so interested in IT technologies because of using many IT terms that are not explained.	The information contained within the toolkit was fairly easy to understand.
Was this toolkit usable & well structured?	Not really. It is addressed to small software house that, when interviewed, do not understand well such a technology and its added value with respect to other open-source solutions.	Yes, but it could be more clear on what regards the differences between user and developer SMEs.	Yes	Yes, it was.	Nevertheless this toolkit is usable especially for SMEs as well as for regional actors. It's also well structured. I appreciate that for explaining how DBE can be used in business a music analogy is used.	Again, I would not describe the information presented as a toolkit. A lot more work needs to be done to create a workable document which can be used by advisors and/or businesses themselves to allow them to fully understand the technology issues.
1st idea on how to improve it	Maybe, try to explain by stepwise examples the procedure to exploit the DBE technology.	At certain points on the document, one gets confused on the technology skills required for SMEs to deploy a DBE system. A better differentiation between software development SMEs and user SMEs would help in this sense.	Better graphics on page one- not readable-general design overhaul	The schema “DBE requirement” is not to read. The letters should be bigger.	The picture connected with “DBE requirement” (Page 1) is after printing unreadable. I advice you to make this picture readable and explain its content.	The toolkit discussed the use of distributed computing, peer to peer networking and the use of open source software, but the toolkit did not mention how using these technologies to form DBEs is different to the technology which is currently in existence today. A more in-depth description of the technologies used within DBEs would be beneficial. This should include comparisons with existing technology and the differences and benefits of the proposed technology over the systems currently in existence.
2nd idea on how to improve it	Maybe, try to explain better its added value, if any.	It is clear how SMEs and customer interact in a regional DBE, but no much is said about their interaction with other networks globally, and hence, how can DBE help reaching new global markets.	Graphics to support the roadmap		The pictures “Real Life Digital Business Environments” and “Real Life Music Delivery” are too complicated and badly understandable. It could have been explained better.	It would be advantageous if the technology toolkit included the following basic advice for businesses. What ICT will my business need to be become part of a DBE? How will my existing ICT infrastructure be integrated into these new systems? What are the costs involved? What are the advantages/disadvantages? What are the security issues? These are the sorts of questions which businesses will be asking.

“What is the SME/company perspective of DBE”	Bonifatti (SEAMLESS)	Extremadura Region	IKT Grenland Region	Malopolska Region	Pardubice Region	Wales Region
Was this toolkit understandable ?	Potential user SMEs (especially small companies) do not understand it alone.	Yes	Yes	Yes, it was.	In our opinion this toolkit is very well comprehensible and understandable. After one reading through it is possible to easily characterise the ecosystem and explain it in a business context. Simultaneously the main user scenarios and different roles that SME companies can play in a digital business ecosystem are well presented.	Again, as before, I would not call the information a ‘toolkit’. The content is good but some of the diagrams are not easy to understand.
Was this toolkit usable & well structured?	Well structured, but just for initiated people.	Yes	Yes	Yes, it was.	The toolkit is usable for all companies interested in clustering and networking. The structure of the document is good organised and individual chapters are well arranged. Only thing that is missing in the submitted toolkit is conclusion, in which could be briefly summarized the key information.	Yes, the toolkit was easy to follow.
1st idea on how to improve it	In general it's very hard to introduce small companies to new organizational models and paradigms. Then likely it's not a problem of this toolkit.	It would be useful if the potential benefits for SMEs on page 2 and 3 could be completed with some concrete or explicit examples of success stories.	Use maturity model from Web-page as introduction and comment this.		The second, third and fourth diagrams are too complicated and less transparent than the others. Also they are not clearly explained in the text. There could be used some simpler diagrams or current figures would be more obviously explained.	Although the toolkit mentioned the benefits which SMEs are likely to see by becoming part of a DBE, there was no solid evidence to back this up in the form of case studies. I believe Case Study examples are the key to entice new businesses into taking part in DBEs.
2nd idea on how to improve it		In the “What are the potential difficulties for SMEs understanding DBE?” chapter, possible solutions to these difficulties would be appreciated, particularly on the method of engagement with SMEs. Could this be developed step by step?	Improve text readability in some of the graphics		The benefits for SME companies should be more stressed and summarized for example in conclusion. At the same time the issues as protecting intellectual property and data security are only shortly mentioned and certainly would be beneficial notice how they are solved.	

“Financial guide for DBE deployment in regions”	Bonifatti (SEAMLESS)	Extremadura Region	IKT Grenland Region	Malopolska Region	Pardubice Region	Wales Region
Was this toolkit understandable?	So and so, very generic.	Yes	Yes	Yes, it was. (“FEDER” means, I think, Fonds européen de développement régional)	After reading this toolkit we can confirm its comprehensibility. For SMEs and ICT-related organisations it is necessary to know what the financial sources and tools for creating DBE are. This toolkit provides a summary of financial possibilities concerning with EU, public and private sector.	This toolkit was easy to understand & detailed the financial aspects of DBE implementation in adequate detail.
Was this toolkit usable & well structured?	Not really for a basic reason: financial engineering remains vague until it is related to specific funding channels that differ very much from each other depending on region, purpose, sector, etc.	Yes	Yes	Yes, it was. Although there is the word “Introduction” missing (it is always in the others guides).	Financing is the key factor for each project. The toolkit is well organised, at the beginning are mentioned the main modes of funding, which are later specified. The EU funding for the period 2007-2013 is up-to-date subject in Czech Republic currently. For SMEs it is really useful and well arranged the chapter “Survey of EU funding available for 2007–2013 period”, its description and objectives. We appreciate the answers for some questions that could be discussed in connection with the financing of DBE main activities.	Yes, the information was detailed and well structured.
1st idea on how to improve it	Probably there is not so much to improve. Maybe you can report real successful cases with real SMEs.	Getting funding for DBE deployment seems quite complex in view of all the possibilities explained. A case study on how the pilot regions funded their experience could be very enlightening.	Again-graphics and color use		The toolkit may put stress on the importance of private sources, e.g. the possibility of using PPP (Public Private Partnership) for DBE financing.	
2nd idea on how to improve it		Although it must be very difficult to account, considering the difference between regions and the scale of projects that can be implemented, some approximation on the basic costs of implementation of a regional DBE would be useful.			Because SME companies have usually a lot of troubles to gain financial resources from banks and other financial institutes it would be helpful to mention some potential difficulties connected with it.	

Annex V - Signature list


First International Stakeholders Workshop
"Digital business Ecosystem: an opportunity for regional development"


Name	Last name	Organization/Region	Signature
Olivier	BAUDELET	DG REGIO, Territorial cooperation Unit	
Tor-Arne	BELLIKA	IKT GRENLAND, Telemark Region, Norway	
Elena	BENSI	TIS-DIGILAB Province of Bolzano, Italy	
Flavio	BONFATTI	SEAMLESS Project	
Michael	BRYAN	East Midlands European Office (EMEO)	
Olivier	CHARRIER	Nord Pas de Calais Regional Government, France	
Frank	CUNNINGHAM	DG INFO, Evaluation and Monitoring	
Kari-Anne	DAVIES	Welsh Assembly Government, United Kingdom	
Paolo	DIPI	OPALS, London School of Economics	
Mario	FARIAS	TIS-DIGILAB Province of Bolzano, Italy	
Silvia	FAVRET	peardrop project, eris@	
Michela	GARBARINI	peardrop project, CSP	
François	GILBERT	peardrop project, AEC	
Nigel	GRADDON	Welsh Assembly Government, United Kingdom	
Gareth	HUGHES	peardrop project, eris@	
Elmar	HUSMANN	peardrop External Advisory Group	
Claudio	INGUAGGIATO	peardrop project, CSP	
Lenka	JURKOVA	Kolice Region	

Brussels, 22nd May
1 of 3
Signature List


First International Stakeholders Workshop
"Digital business Ecosystem: an opportunity for regional development"


Name	Last name	Organization/Region	Signature
Aurea	KUMETAITIENE	SDC, Lithuania Government	
Margrita	LAGO	DG INFO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	
Eimon	LAVIN	Welsh Assembly Government, United Kingdom	
Marion	LE LOUARN	DG INFO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	
Karolina H.	LIPINSKA	Pomerania Region, Poland	
Rita	MALAVASI	Regione Emilia Romagna	
Carolina	MARCO BELLVER	Valencia Regional Government, Spain	
Jan	MATUCHA	peardrop project, EPMA	
Sophie	MAVOR	peardrop project, CM	
Margaretha	MAZURA	LEKTOR Project, EMF	
Tim	MILLER	EMNET, East Midlands, United Kingdom	
Francesco	NACHRA	DG INFO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	
Andrea	NICOLAI	OPALS NoE, TE Italy	
Izeta	OBRŠALOVÁ	University of Pardubice, Czech Republic	
Rosemary	O'CONNOR	peardrop project, CM	
Eoghan	O'NEILL	DG INFO, Policy Line	
Miguel Angel	PEREZ	Aragon Technological Institute, Spain	
Leonardo	PICINETTI	Emilia Romagna Region, Italy	

Brussels, 22nd May
2 of 3
Signature List


First International Stakeholders Workshop
"Digital business Ecosystem: an opportunity for regional development"


Name	Last name	Organization/Region	
Agnieszka	POLARSKA	Marshal Office of the Malopolska Region, Poland	<i>[Signature]</i>
Florence	PUNZANO	Aquitaine Regional Government, France	<i>[Signature]</i>
Riviera	RIVERA LEÓN (TE)	TS, Italy	<i>[Signature]</i>
Gloria	RODRIGUEZ PINA	FUNDECYT, Extremadura, Spain	<i>[Signature]</i>
Aidan	ROE	peardrop External Advisory Group	<i>[Signature]</i>
Gérard	SANTUCCI	DG INFSO, Networked Enterprise & RFID Unit	<i>[Signature]</i>
Nagaraj	SEETHARAMON KONDA	University of Central England, United Kingdom	<i>[Signature]</i>
Marco	SEPPÀ	peardrop External Advisory Group	<i>[Signature]</i>
Manu	SETÁLA	peardrop project, TCH	<i>[Signature]</i>
Rod	SHELTON	University of Central England, West Midlands	<i>[Signature]</i>
Anna	BIBILLA	Piedmont Region, Italy	<i>[Signature]</i>
Ken	STOCKL	peardrop External Advisory Group	<i>[Signature]</i>
Patrick	SULLIVAN	peardrop project, CMI	<i>[Signature]</i>
JR	TOMČEK	Moravian Silesian Region, Czech Republic	<i>[Signature]</i>
Ester	TORRES	peardrop project, eris@	<i>[Signature]</i>
Nicola	TRUDU	peardrop project, eris@	<i>[Signature]</i>
Javier	VAL	Aragon Technological Institute, Spain	<i>[Signature]</i>
Irina	ZÁLISOVÁ	peardrop project, EPMA	<i>[Signature]</i>

YOLANDA URSULA ZAHARAK WS
 Brussels, 22nd May 3 of 3 Signature List

Annex VI - Presentations of the day

The presentations of the day are available online, at the **peardrop** website (<http://www.peardrop.eu/Events.html>) well as in the "Third DE Concertation Meeting" webpage (<http://www.digital-ecosystems.org/events/2007.05-fp6cluster/3cluster.html>)