

**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 2.8**  
**“Report on the International Stakeholders Workshop II”**

**Due date of deliverable:** February 2008

**Actual submission date:** March 2008

**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:** CMI

**Revision:** Final

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

“Second Digital Business Ecosystem International Stakeholders Workshop”

**“Digital Business Ecosystems:  
Planning a regional deployment”**

Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> - Friday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2008

“Monasterium PoortAckere” Oude Houtlei 56 - 9000 Gent (Belgium)

**Report & Conclusions of the event**

## Table of contents

<b>1. peardrop International Stakeholders Workshops: background information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Introduction to the Second International Stakeholders Workshop</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Scope of the workshop &amp; invitation list</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Summary of the presentations and discussions</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. Final conclusions of the workshop</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6. Concluding remarks and assessment of the event against the suggestions of the European Commission reviewers of May 2007</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex I - Agenda of the workshop</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Annex II - Attendees list (2 pages)</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex III - peardrop's bulletins</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Annex IV - Guidelines for discussion DAY 2</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex V – Compiled results of the workshop evaluation</b>	<b>21</b>

**Note:** all links referring to the peardrop website are accessible AFTER registration to the portal [www.peardrop.eu](http://www.peardrop.eu)  
Registration is open to everyone and free of charge.

## **1. peardrop International Stakeholders Workshops: background information**

As presented in **peardrop**'s description of work, during the lifespan of the project the consortium is responsible for the organisation of three International Stakeholders' Workshops (ISW).

### *1.1 Workshops' Objectives*

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.

<b>Workshop 1 “Digital Business Ecosystem: an opportunity for regional development”</b>
<p>The event took place in Brussels on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of May 2007. Its specific purposes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ To promote the results of Phase 1 of the project (especially the five Initial Guides on five DBE sub-domains).</li><li>▪ To develop a discussion on those with targeted key stakeholders.</li></ul> <p>The expected outcome of this first workshop was to help ‘signpost’ for Phase 2 the kind of DBE deployment tools - and models - that stakeholders would consider useful. In addition, the project used the discussion and the feedback gained to provide illustrative material for, and guide subsequent revisions of, the initial guides regarding the 5 DBE topics addressed by the project.</p>
<b>Workshop 2 “Digital business Ecosystem: planning a regional deployment”</b>
<p>The objectives of this second meeting, organised in Gent on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> of February 2008, were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ To review the work in progress of the project, and especially the work relating to the identification of models, tools and systems in support of DBE deployment.</li><li>▪ To enable an intensive exchange of views between selected regional representatives on their experiences with respect to preparing their regional DBE deployment plans.</li></ul> <p>The expected outcome of this event was the validation of the <b>peardrop</b> tools and to listen to regional expectations in terms of guidance for DBE deployment planning.</p>
<b>Workshop 3 “Digital Ecosystems of Knowledge, Business and Culture”<sup>1</sup></b>
<p>This will be the final <b>peardrop</b> workshop which will take place in the framework of a wider event targeted to regional representatives (the eris@ Annual Conference 2008: “<i>Opportunities and Rewards for Regional Development through ICT: New Paradigms – New Challenges</i>”, see <a href="http://www.erisa.be">www.erisa.be</a> – Cardiff, 11<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> June 2008). The focus of this final workshop will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ To promote and discuss the results of the project as widely as possible, especially the draft Synthesis Guide &amp; the final Toolkit for Regional DBE Deployment.</li><li>▪ To gain feedback on and promote the regional DBE deployment plans.</li><li>▪ To debate a DBE road map - especially <b>peardrop</b>'s proposals and recommendations for FP7, the Structural Funds, and other European policies (Lisbon, i2010, the CIP etc.) – to be included in the “<i>Report on peardrop's contribution to ERA Coordination Activities</i>”.</li></ul>

### *1.2 Workshops' Target Audience*

In relation to the objectives presented in above, each event has also a well defined target audience:

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, European Commission officials, members of the **peardrop** Advisory Group, and project partners.

---

<sup>1</sup> Title to be confirmed.

Workshop 2 - For a limited invited audience only since it was shaped as an intensive work meeting between project partners, a small group of qualified experts and selected representatives of the partner and associated regions (13 in total). In addition, participation was also open to European Commission officials, the **peardrop** Advisory Group and project partners.

Workshop 3 - This will be an open event, although the specific participation of some key regional stakeholders from associated regions, of the **peardrop** Advisory Group and of the European Commission will be invited (as for Workshop 2).

### 1.3 Workshops' Indicators

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
	Participants	45
International Stakeholder Workshop 2	Regions represented	12
	Participants	40
International Stakeholder Workshop 3	Regions represented	25
	Participants	60

The results of each workshop are recorded in the events' report, available at [www.peardrop.eu](http://www.peardrop.eu). ("Event" section).

## **2. Introduction to the Second International Stakeholders Workshop**

The second workshop was organised on Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> and Friday 8<sup>th</sup> of February 2008. The event took place in Gent, in the premises of the "Monasterium PoortAckere", a nice closed environment that was chosen for its unique atmosphere.

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

- The agenda of the event
- The speaker's template for presentations as well as clear event guidelines.
- Details on how to reach the venue (train schedule, road directions, map of the city etc.)

The workshop was chaired by Gareth Hughes, **peardrop**'s Project Manager, and was attended by 37 participants (see Annex II).

At arrival, each participant was given an information package comprising:

- The final 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 **peardrop** brochure
- The split of groups for the two days
- Some guidelines for the work group discussion of Day 2 (Annex IV)
- The slides of the presentations of Day 1 that were provided to the organisers before the event (available for reference and download in the event page: <http://www.peardrop.eu/events/Lists/Events%20list/DispForm.aspx?ID=10&Source=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Epeardrop%2Eeu%2Fevents%2FPages%2Fpeardrop%5Fevents%2Easpx>)
- A workshop evaluation questionnaire (see Annex V for a summary of the feedback collected)
- The eris@ brochure

### **3. Scope of the workshop & invitation list**

As mentioned in the invitations sent to the targeted audience, the aim of this second **peardrop** International Stakeholders Workshop, “Digital Business Ecosystems: Planning a Regional Deployment”, was to review the work in progress in 13 partner and associated regions, especially that relating to identification and use of models, tools and systems in support of Digital Business Ecosystems (DBE) deployment. This main objective was achieved through the definition of a well-structured agenda for the event and a follow-up action for the collection of feedback (via the “evaluation questionnaire” included in the information package - see Annex V, which provides a summary table of the answers collected).

The workshop was also the occasion for an intensive exchange of experience between regional representatives on best practice (as well as obstacles and difficulties) with respect to preparing their regional DBE deployment strategies and plans.

In fact, this workshop was planned as, and indeed was, a “working” meeting at which all participants contributed and took an active part. This was achieved through the organisation of small discussion groups and the presentation of individual regional planning experiences. Adequate time was given to discussion and for reflection on the issues arising from the practitioners’ experiences and opinions.

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 (2 invites sent)
- 13 Focus Group regions (26 invites sent, on average 2 per region)

The choice of inviting only those individuals directly involved in the DBE deployment planning process with **peardrop** was due to the specific structure of the event. Being a “working” meeting, all **peardrop** associated regions were required to contribute by preparing a draft DBE Deployment plan that they were asked to present on the first day of the event.

In light of this, it was considered that the attendance of individuals external to the direct **peardrop** collaboration process would not be appropriate at that stage. It is worth mentioning that all of the 13 associated regions accompanying the **peardrop** project during its second phase were directly - or indirectly - represented at the workshop.

The following list indicates which European regions contributed to the event.

**France:** Aquitaine, Nord Pas de Calais

**United Kingdom:** East Midlands, Wales

**Italy:** Emilia-Romagna, Piedmont

**Spain** Extremadura, Valencia

**Czech Republic:** Pardubice, Vysocina

**Poland:** Pomerania,

**Estonia:** Tartu,

**Norway:** Telemark

The attendees of two **peardrop** associated regions (Nord Pas de Calais and Telemark) could finally not attend due to last minute commitments that they were unable to avoid and they asked respectively to AEC and TCH, to represent them at the workshop. This was accepted:

- given the strong relationship and collaboration that AEC and TCH have with them.
- because, in both cases, they had already provided the organisers with their presentation for the group discussion taking place on Day 1.

As indicated by the attached attendance list (Annex II), participants at the **peardrop** Second International Stakeholders Workshop can be categorised as follows:

- European Commission Representatives: 2
- **peardrop** (partners and External Advisory Group): 16
- Focus Group Regions: 19

Travel and subsistence grants were at the disposal of those regional representatives needing financial support to participate at the workshop (maximum 1 representative per region).

#### **4. Summary of the presentations and discussions**

##### *4.1 Opening and Introduction*

The workshop was opened by **Gareth Hughes**, **peardrop** Project Manager and eris@ Chief Executive Officer, who welcomed the participants, introduced **peardrop** and the scope of workshop. He also took the occasion to thank the regions for attending the event and for their collaboration and investment in time and resources. In his opening speech, he reminded as well that the early adoption of new technologies can bring benefits in terms of competitiveness, in particular when supporting SMEs.

Gareth Hughes' introduction was followed by a speech by **Francesco Nachira**, **peardrop** project officer, from the RFID Unit of DG Information Society & Media of the European Commission. In his presentation, Francesco Nachira:

- Underlined that the role of **peardrop** is to serve as a bridge between DBE pilot experiences and a more general uptake of the concept and deployment of the DBE related platform. This project has been recognised as having the difficult task to communicate the DBE concept and to mobilise regions.
- Stressed that the Digital Ecosystem concept can indeed be applied to different areas, depending on regional needs and priorities and for this reason there is a widely spread interest in the concept.
- Explained that, although the structure of the DBE platform is not yet stable, the technology developed within the DBE Integrated Project (whose results are available for download at: [http://www.digital-ecosystem.org/DBE\\_Main/links2](http://www.digital-ecosystem.org/DBE_Main/links2)) can represent an important opportunity for re-adoption by the Open Source Software community.
- Informed that the European Commission's investment on Digital Ecosystems (DE) for 2007-2013 is evolving. For the Work Programme 2007-2008, and, probably for the following one, there are no direct funds foreseen for DE. Nevertheless, there are some possibilities within the Structural Funds if regions include DBE in their operational programming. Some funding opportunities have also been offered under the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP).

In answer to a question arising from the audience, Francesco Nachira clarified the difference between the recently ended DBE Integrated Project (IP) and the OPAALS Network of Excellence (NoE) as follows:

- The DBE IP, started under FP6, was a new instrument integrating different sciences and aiming at producing a first raw DBE platform.

- The OPAALS NoE, also financed under FP6, is a more theoretical network focussing on the economic aspects of the paradigm, and less on the related DBE technology.

#### 4.2 Day 1 group session: “Presentation of DBE deployment plans in **peardrop** region”

The aim of this session was to:

- Allow people to get to know each other and learn from their different regional DBE experiences
- Exchange points of view and ideas
- Share & develop solutions

Group 1 - The main points emerging in the discussion among the three regions of this group (Extremadura, Spain; Nord Pas de Calais, France; Pardubice, Czech Republic and Emilia Romagna, Italy) were the following:

- DBE can be a useful tool for increasing competitiveness, also considering the role that SMEs in the IT sector can play thanks to the Open Source approach of the platform.
- In order to implement DBE, regions should foresee actions dedicated to training so as to improve specific skills.
- For launching a DBE, the “catalyst” and its trust relationship with local SMEs play a central role.
- In order to deploy DBE, regions should guarantee the basic infrastructure (e.g. broadband) and should mobilise the appropriate academic players to develop the specific skills.
- The deployment of a DBE brings a change into the whole business process since it brings together users and ICT providers so to avoid mis-trust and support ICT adoption.
- There is a strong need for a testing platform to help dissemination, validation, exchange of experiences, and for supporting the change of mindset.

Group 2 - The second group, composed of Wales (United Kingdom), Aquitaine (France), Pomerania (Poland) and Valencia (Spain), highlighted the following points:

- When choosing the sector for DBE deployment, regions take different approaches: some focus on SMEs while others considered supply chains dominated by large companies; some regions plan sector-based deployments, while others are more geographically based (also depending on the territory’s existing economic situation).
- To build a good business case for a DBE deployment, there is a need for champions (at least one in each region but preferably more) although the difficulty in getting people to appreciate the need for a DBE is recognised.
- Awareness raising & gaining commitment of key players is a central issue to tackle (though workshops, champions and demonstrators) given the fact that this might imply going against the ideological mindset of those running SMEs. It should be borne in mind that public authorities sometimes have challenges in engaging with the private sector. The deployment planning of DBE requires a multi-phased approach to first prepare the ground in the region before moving into an actual DBE deployment.
- DBE Legal & Governance Issues depend on the specific regional contexts. In general terms, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) should be resolved while considering data protection and security as well.
- The DBE Technology Platform is a real issue since the DBE concept is very difficult to understand. There is a clear need for an open-source demonstrator for stakeholders to “play with”. There is the need to have something concrete to show people. At the moment

there is a disparity between theoretical benefits understood by the few and the practice and beliefs of those who are the potential beneficiaries.

- Some of the ideas related to DBE are difficult to understand and in some cases they are described in a complicated way. There is a need to “keep it simple”.

Group 3 - The third group (East Midlands, United Kingdom; Tartu, Estonia; Piedmont, Italy; Vysocina, Czech Republic; Telemark, Norway) also had a useful discussion. In particular, these regions highlighted some specific points as shown below:

- The DBE concept can marry different choices of sector for its implementation, as suggested by the different areas of deployment chosen by the regions (tourism, green technologies, textile, mechanical, furniture etc.). In all cases, DBE can be seen as a *potential* model for regional development.
- For the creation of a business case, it is suggested to include with the Guide to Planning a DBE Deployment a break-down in phases of the steps for implementing it. The inclusion of the DBE concept in the ROPS, for example, could be considered as a possible starting point together with a “pre-planning phase” of awareness arising.
- The need for a demonstrator and for the exchange of experiences is clear. In addition, it would be of help to have a clear idea of which applications are already available for general use, and also to understand those that have still to be developed.
- Concerning the access to physical infrastructure, development of the DBE platform should consider the use of mobile technology as well. Moreover, to programme the required applications, regions could consider collaborating with universities and computer science students. This could be of help in reducing costs related to DBE deployment and help in managing the risk of implementing a totally innovative concept.

The presentations of the regional deployment plans are available online, at the **peardrop** website <http://www.peardrop.eu/events/Lists/Events%20list/DispForm.aspx?ID=10&Source=http%3A%2F%2Fwww%2Epeardrop%2Eeu%2Fevents%2FPages%2Fpeardrop%5Fevents%2Easpx> )

In summary, presentations have shown that the target sectors for the deployment of DBE in the 13 associated regions are:

- ICT Services
- Tourism
- Bio-technology / Nano-technology
- Jewellery
- Infrastructure
- Textiles
- “Green Technologies

#### 4.3 Open discussion

The session was chaired by **Patrick Sullivan**, from the **peardrop** project.

The first question was raised by **Tim Miller** and was built upon the need for a demonstrator. In his contribution, Tim Miller proposed to build a demonstrator for the sector of application that could answer to the interest of more than a single region. The issue was taken up by the representatives of the European Commission who suggested exploiting the results already developed by the EFFORT project and the ones to come in the next months from the OPAALS NoE.

In response to this suggestion, **Gareth Hughes** proposed to consider the creation of a network of regions, though the co-finance of programme such as INTERREG IVC, for building a stable platform responding to some common regional needs. Such a platform could represent the core

argument for persuading public authorities on the role of DBE in supporting regional growth, competitiveness and the development of eGovernment.

**Patrick Sullivan** commented that regions have underlined the need for moving from a prototype version of the platform to a full rollout capability if they are to consider DBE as a tool for regional development. **Gareth Hughes** added the further complication that at this stage there is still insufficient data to present a completely full picture of what the DBE impacts will be at regional or local level. **Carolina Marco-Bellver** added that, today, DBE is like a “template” that regions are validating and that needs to be improved. Nevertheless, she stressed that ICT in general is an area of work strictly related to innovation.

An additional point was added to the discussion: the need for a clear methodology to convince users, touching challenges like to need for a good technological trust as well as a collective mentality securing technology.

In wrapping up the sessions, **Gareth Hughes** highlighted the following points:

- There are differences among regions; therefore, there is no one single deployment plan model.
- The role of **peardrop** is not to deploy, or to guarantee deployment, but to raise awareness and interest.
- Regions mostly take decisions on the basis of the “return on investment” and tend to be risk averse and tight on risk management. Perhaps, regions should consider also the risks of not taking action.

#### *4.4 Day 2 – Group session on “DBE regional deployment issues”*

Most of the time available on the second day was also dedicated to group discussions. The aim of this session was to define and clarify:

- The key steps/actions for DBE deployment at regional level.
- The region-specific issues and how to handle them.
- What is still missing in the **peardrop** toolkit.
- Which way forward for DBE – regional perspective.

Group A - The regions of this discussion group were: Aquitaine (France), East Midlands (United Kingdom), Valencia (Spain) and Pardubice (Czech Republic).

As reported by Gareth Hughes, regions agreed on the need to respect and understand cultural and contextual differences, while taking advantage of existing platforms and creating new ones when needed. In particular, a new type of Digital Ecosystem was suggested: the one applied to the government services and activities: the Digital Government Ecosystem (DGE). In fact, the use of the DBE concept by public authorities directly was recognised, in particular for government to business services (G2B).

Concerning the toolkits, regions assessed the need to:

- Include in the set, tools and materials related to Intellectual Property Rights and Media.
- Clarify which training materials are already available.
- Have a concrete demonstrator.

It was also suggested to use awards at the regional/local level to guarantee additional press coverage and awareness raising. This could help, on one side, to gain credibility from outsiders, and, on the other, to approach IT providers.

The future challenge that **peardrop** and its associated regions will face in the future, is how to continue sharing knowledge once the (peardrop) project will end.

Group B - Group B was composed by representatives from Tartu (Estonia), Nord Pas de Calais (France), Emilia Romagna (Italy) and Wales (United Kingdom).

The discussion on the key steps and actions for DBE deployment focussed in the importance of gaining political commitment for DBE. The most difficult challenge for doing this was considered to be the articulation on how DBE differs from current technologies. This is mainly because regions tend to take a strategic approach to decisions which entails difficulties for taking risks on something new; in order to avoid such a burden, it was considered useful to introduce the new concepts in comparison to what is already widespread knowledge. In addition, a central point for introducing DBE is to do it in relation to existing or potential local needs.

Another important step for DBE deployment is the involvement of “users”. On this, Patrick Sullivan explained that, while some regions are looking at DBE from a software development perspective, Wales has taken it from a different angle: looking at DBE on the basis of local needs with the aim of reversing the existing socio-economic decline (but also using DBE as a networking enabler).

Referring to what is still missing from the toolkits, regions made the following suggestions:

- Include a phased approach, which the tools can fit into as being part of a wider process.
- Information for implementers on “failure cases” to know what to avoid in implementation.
- Provide some guidelines on how to develop the framework to include the DBE concept in the Regional Operational Programmes.
- Clarify the differences between the DBE technology and Web 2.0. This could be done underlining that DBE is built on a peer to peer (P2P) basis, that gives the opportunity to each user to share data while keeping full control of it (different from Web 2.0 tools, where the rights on personal information that the user provides are often given away due to the fact that, once the data are archived by the system, even if these will be later deleted by the user, the platforms maintain the right to use archive and, therefore, re-use it again).

As for the way forward for DBE at regional level, regions considered the need to write DBE into the regional programmes. It was also stressed that DBE does not simply imply technological changes, but comprises, above all, an organizational shift towards a sharing of knowledge - which is difficult for those SME that consider knowledge as the “wealth of the enterprise”.

Group C - The regions taking part in this discussion group were: Extremadura (Spain), Vysocina (Czech Republic), Pomerania (Poland) and Piedmont (Italy).

The main items of the discussion touched on the “steps” that each region has taken in preparing its DBE plan. The main challenges that emerged from the presentations were the following:

- The approach taken by regions varies depending on whether the region is seeking to work with an existing cluster or if it is looking at a more ‘green field’ DBE deployment. Where clusters already exist, the Legal issues are less challenging in the first instance. If the approach is more ‘green field’ then there is a lot more policy related work to be done first.
- Standardisation and interconnectivity are key points in the process of opening up the market.
- Although funds can be partially released with public calls - using Structural Funds, the participation of enterprises in the costs is also envisaged (for securing their commitment).
- Regional innovation and development agencies can play a role in analysing the technical feasibility of the deployment.
- Even if the DBE tools provided by the (peardrop) project represent a good basis for political understanding of the concept, they do not address sufficiently the theme of real DBE deployment.
- One option for the development of DBE applications it to work with regional universities. This approach has the added benefit of investing in and stimulating the entrepreneurs of the future.
- Regions willing to deploy DBE are interested in the transfer of knowledge in this domain; therefore, they should be given opportunities to exchange experiences and practices.

- Although the “pilot” period should be supported by the public authority, SMEs should be involved in the planning process of DBE from the beginning, also with the aim of facilitating public-private partnerships. To engage SMEs in the process, the use of a demonstrator would be quite useful.
- Regions are, in a first phase, attracted and interested in the concept of DBE.

The discussion of the group regarding what is still missing in the peardrop toolkit suggested the following:

- Include clarifications on IPR and data protection.
- Provide guidance on the business model for Open Source.
- Provide some case studies and related budget figures (possibly, giving also a return on investment view), giving both success stories as well as failures.
- It would be useful to provide more ‘navigation’ guidance as to how to use the toolkits, It would be useful to separate high level (macro) planning from more detailed deployment planning so the reader is clear on which elements to use at which stage of the process.

Regions explained that, for the future, they would expect a follow-up project (for which it would be useful to foresee some budget for regional involvement).

## **5. Final conclusions of the workshop**

The two day workshop gave to all participants the possibility to share experiences on DBE deployment planning issues. To summarise the discussions, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- There is a real interest among regions for the concept of DBE. In fact, DBE is recognised as being a viable socio-economic model for supporting regional development.
- Although a DBE technological platform exists, it is still unstable. This instability is considered as one of the major factors hindering the real deployment of DBE. Achieving a stable core platform is an urgent priority for regional development.
- Regions and DBE catalysts feel the need for a practical demonstrator of the DBE technology in order to (a) start the real implementations at regional level; (b) raise awareness on DBE among different regional actors: in particular, the private sector and SME who, as a matter of fact, ask for tangible demonstrations.
- The guidelines and tools provided by **peardrop** represent a positive input for regional deployment of DBE. Nevertheless, participants considered that there is still some scope for improvement. In particular, it was advised that the project:
  - highlights in a clearer way the unique benefits of DBE;
  - produces a “context” for the tools provided (some kind of introduction to DBE deployment);
  - provides more concrete examples;
  - demonstrate the link with the “knowledge economy”, encouraging SMEs to consider the concept of *co-opetition* as a means of ensuring their future success.
- DE cluster projects should develop tighter links. In this view, **peardrop** should share with OPAALS inputs on what the regional needs are, in particular in terms of DBE technology expectations.
- Today, the existing knowledge on DBE is quite dispersed. There is a need for an open space for distributed knowledge that the DBE community can use to exchange knowledge in a practical and distributed way. The value of regions being able to come together to share their experiences and have an ongoing facilitated dialogue should be considered for any future project development.

## **6. Concluding remarks and assessment of the event against the suggestions of the European Commission reviewers of May 2007**

### *6.1 Concluding remarks*

**peardrop**'s second International Stakeholders Workshop can be considered successful for the level of attendance and the useful outcomes that it produced.

Checking the results and the outcomes against the indicators reported on page 4, it becomes clear that the 19 regional representatives from 13 associated regions and the total number of participants (37) are in line with the expected indicators set in the project description of work (namely: 12 regions represented & 40 participants).

Notwithstanding the different nature of this second workshop compared to the one held in May 2007, the second **peardrop** International Stakeholders Workshop benefited from the very active participation and engagement of associated regions. In fact, prior to the event, all participants had worked on the planning of a DBE deployment using the tools developed by the project.



The feedback of attendees has confirmed the success of the event, which met with participants' expectations.

### *6.2 Assessment of the event against EC reviewers' suggestions of May 2007*

The table below reports the suggestions that the European Commission reviewers had made at the informal review of May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2007 and the explanation on how each point was taken into account in the organisation of this second International Stakeholders Workshop.

<b>Project Reviewer Suggestion</b>	<b>Event Assessment</b>
<i><u>Advance planning with objectives made clear to speakers to help guarantee the quality of the presentations.</u></i>	The date for the next workshop was already agreed back in May 2007 (4 <sup>th</sup> PMC Meeting) and communication was included in the communications sent to the <b>peardrop</b> focus group regions as well as in the Memorandum of Collaboration that some of them signed to become associated regions, in <b>peardrop</b> 's second phase (Mid July 2007).
<i><u>Better planning of the timing of the workshop to avoid clashing with other similar events.</u></i>	The meeting was organised well in advance, making sure no other relevant meeting would be organised/planned in parallel.
<i><u>Send the toolkit in advance together with a short questionnaire to provide feedback.</u></i>	Organisers provided well in advance all contacted regions with an easy to use excel questionnaire that they were invited to submit BEFORE the meeting. This was justified by the need for the organisers to better focus the discussion of the working groups. A more general questionnaire on the event (including a question on the tools) was also circulated and collected.
<i><u>Provide printouts of the presentations/speeches in advance.</u></i>	This comment was taken on board and every effort was made to collect, in advance, as many presentation as possible. 8 presentations were provided to participants in the form of handouts before the event.
<i><u>Allocate adequate discussion times to insure participants are continuously involved.</u></i>	The whole structure of the event was built on open discussion sessions (either in groups, or in plenary).
<i><u>If language issues are felt to be present, arrange translation to help participants engaging in the discussions.</u></i>	The suggestion was indeed pointing out a relevant issue. Nevertheless, <b>peardrop</b> cannot afford to offer such services for two main reasons: limitation of the budget and the number of languages to be covered (at least 5). The Chairs & Rapporteurs for each session were however given guidance to ensure that discussions and presentations were clear and followed the format agreed at the outset. This helped to ensure that all participants were able to maximise their involvement in the event.

## Annex I - Agenda of the workshop

Event sponsored by		In collaboration with the European Commission DG INFSO Unit D4 "Networked Enterprises & Radio Frequency Identification (RFID)"	
			
"Second Digital Business Ecosystem International Stakeholders Workshop"			
<h1>"Digital Business Ecosystems: Planning a regional deployment"</h1>			
<h2>AGENDA DAY 1 - Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2008</h2>			
10:00 – 10:30	<b>Registration &amp; Coffee</b>		
10:30 – 11:00	<b>Opening &amp; Introduction</b>		
	<b>Francesco Nachira</b> , RFID Unit, DG Information Society & Media, EC <b>Gareth Hughes</b> , <b>peardrop</b> Project Manager, CEO eris@		
11:00 – 16:00	<b>Presentation of DBE deployment plans in peardrop regions</b>		
	<i>The aim of this session is to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- allow people to know each other and learn from their different regional DBE experiences</li> <li>- exchange points of view and ideas</li> <li>- share &amp; develop solutions</li> </ul>		
	<b>Group 1</b> Chair: Patrick Sullivan Rapporteur: Michela Pollone	<b>Group 2</b> Chair : François Gilbert Rapporteur : Aidan Roe	<b>Group 3</b> Chair: Gareth Hughes Rapporteur: Dagmar Vránová
11:00 – 11:15	<b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>	<b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>	<b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>
11:15 – 13:00	<b>Regional Presentations (Part 1)</b> <b>Extremadura</b> , Spain <b>Nord Pas de Calais</b> , France	<b>Regional Presentations (Part 1)</b> <b>Wales</b> , United Kingdom <b>Aquitaine</b> , France	<b>Regional Presentations (Part 1)</b> <b>East Midlands</b> , United Kingdom <b>Tartu</b> , Estonia <b>Piedmont</b> , Italy
13:00 – 14:30	<i>Lunch Break – Networking Session</i>		
14:30 – 16:00	<b>Regional Presentations (Part 2)</b> <b>Pardubice</b> , Czech Republic <b>Emila Romagna</b> , Italy	<b>Regional Presentations (Part 2)</b> <b>Pomerania</b> , Poland <b>Valencia</b> , Spain	<b>Regional Presentations (Part 2)</b> <b>Vysocina</b> , Czech Republic <b>Telemark</b> , Norway
16:00 – 16:15	<i>Coffee Break – Networking Session</i>		
16:15 – 17:30	<b>Reporting back from the discussion tables: "The ideal DBE deployment plan"</b>		
	<i>Rapporteurs of the 3 groups will present a full summary of the group work (15-20 minutes each).</i> <b>Michela Pollone</b> , <b>peardrop</b> Project, CSP, Piedmont, Italy <b>Aidan Roe</b> , <b>peardrop</b> Advisory Group Member, Innovation Exchange, Ireland <b>Dagmar Vránová</b> , <b>peardrop</b> Project, EPMA, Vysocina, Czech Republic		
17:30 – 18:40	<b>Open Discussion</b>		
	Chaired by <b>Patrick Sullivan</b> , <b>peardrop</b> Project, CM International		
18:40 – 18:45	<b>Conclusions of Day 1</b>		
	<b>Gareth Hughes</b> , <b>peardrop</b> Project Manager, CEO eris@		
20:00	<b>"peardrop networking dinner"</b> - "Monasterium PoortAckere"		

## AGENDA DAY 2 - Friday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2008

9:00 – 9:05	<b>Opening</b> <b>Gareth Hughes, peardrop</b> Project Manager, CEO eris@												
9:05 – 10:45	<b>"DBE Regional deployment issues"</b> <i>The aim of this session is to define and clarify:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the key steps/actions for DBE deployment at regional level</li><li>- the region-specific issues and how to handle them</li><li>- what is still missing in the <b>peardrop</b> toolkit.</li><li>- which is the way forward for DBE from a regional perspective?</li></ul> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Group A</th><th>Group B</th><th>Group C</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Chair: Irina Zálšiová Rapporteur: Gareth Hughes</td><td>Chair: Ken Stockil Rapporteur: Oumeira Tegally</td><td>Chair: Manu Setälä. Rapporteur: Rosemary O'Connor</td></tr><tr><td>9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b></td><td>9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b></td><td>9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b></td></tr><tr><td>9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Aquitaine</b>, France <b>East Midlands</b>, UK <b>Valencia</b>, Spain <b>Pardubice</b>, Czech Republic</td><td>9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Tartu</b>, Estonia <b>Nord Pas de Calais</b>, France <b>Emilia Romagna</b>, Italy <b>Wales</b>, United Kingdom</td><td>9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Piemonte</b>, Italy <b>Extremadura</b>, Spain <b>Vysocina</b>, Czech Republic <b>Pomerania</b>, Poland</td></tr></tbody></table>	Group A	Group B	Group C	Chair: Irina Zálšiová Rapporteur: Gareth Hughes	Chair: Ken Stockil Rapporteur: Oumeira Tegally	Chair: Manu Setälä. Rapporteur: Rosemary O'Connor	9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>	9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>	9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>	9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Aquitaine</b> , France <b>East Midlands</b> , UK <b>Valencia</b> , Spain <b>Pardubice</b> , Czech Republic	9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Tartu</b> , Estonia <b>Nord Pas de Calais</b> , France <b>Emilia Romagna</b> , Italy <b>Wales</b> , United Kingdom	9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Piemonte</b> , Italy <b>Extremadura</b> , Spain <b>Vysocina</b> , Czech Republic <b>Pomerania</b> , Poland
Group A	Group B	Group C											
Chair: Irina Zálšiová Rapporteur: Gareth Hughes	Chair: Ken Stockil Rapporteur: Oumeira Tegally	Chair: Manu Setälä. Rapporteur: Rosemary O'Connor											
9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>	9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>	9:05 – 9:20 <b>Introduction &amp; Tour de Table</b>											
9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Aquitaine</b> , France <b>East Midlands</b> , UK <b>Valencia</b> , Spain <b>Pardubice</b> , Czech Republic	9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Tartu</b> , Estonia <b>Nord Pas de Calais</b> , France <b>Emilia Romagna</b> , Italy <b>Wales</b> , United Kingdom	9:20 – 10:45 <b>Pannel discussion</b> <b>Piemonte</b> , Italy <b>Extremadura</b> , Spain <b>Vysocina</b> , Czech Republic <b>Pomerania</b> , Poland											
10:45 – 11:00	<i>Coffee Break – Networking Session</i>												
11:00 – 11:30	<b>Reporting back from the discussion tables: "DBE Regional deployment issues"</b> <i>Rapporteurs will present the list of issues that have emerged during the parallel sessions to the plenary</i> <b>Gareth Hughes, peardrop</b> Project, CEO eris@ <b>Oumeira Tegally, peardrop</b> Project, AEC, Aquitaine, France <b>Rosemary O'Connor, peardrop</b> Project, CM International												
11:30 – 12:45	<b>Participants' comments &amp; suggestions</b> (tour de table) <i>At this point, all participants will be invited to give their feedback on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the DBE toolkits</li><li>- the workshop</li><li>- the real feasibility that they see in their region to proceed with the deployment of DBE</li></ul>												
12:45 – 13:00	<b>Conclusions of the workshop</b>												

**Annex II - Attendees list (2 pages)**

peardrop Promoting Business Ecosystems						Second International Stakeholders Workshop		
Name	Last name	Organisation	Country	Signature				
Julie	Bagieu	SILOGraphic/aNTIC	France					
Radek	Bejdak	EPMA	Czech Republic					
Keri-Anne	Davies	Welsh Assembly Gov.	United Kingdom					
Raúl	De Tena Rubio	FUNDECYT	Spain					
Silvia	Favret	eris@	Belgium					
Michela	Garbarini	CSP	Italy					
Chekib	Gharbi	DIGIPOINT	France					
François	Gilbert	AEC	France					
Henri	Hanson	Tartu Science Park	Estonia					
Marketa	Hermanova	Vysocina region	Czech Republic					
Gareth	Hughes	eris@	Belgium					
Claudio	Inguaggiato	Finpiemonte SPA	Italy					
Václav	Jáchim	Vysocina region	Czech Republic					
Maigorzata	Jankiewicz	Office of the Marshall	Poland					
Jiri	Krupka	University of Pardubice	Czech Republic					
Vincent	Lacarde	Aquitaine region	France					
Simon	Lavin	Welsh Assembly Government	United Kingdom					
Marion	Le Louarn	European Commission	Belgium					
Karolina Natalia	Lipinska	Office of the Marshall	Poland					

## Second International Stakeholders Workshop

Name	Last name	Organisation	Country	Signature
Sandra	Lotti	Regione Emilia Romagna	Italy	
Carolina	Marco-Bellver	Valencia Region	Spain	
Tim	Miller	EMNET	United Kingdom	
Francesco	Nachira	European Commission	Belgium	F. Nachira
Rosemary	O'Connor	CMI	Ireland	
Ales	Pekarek	EPMA	Czech Republic	
Michela	Pollone	CSP	Italy	
Romana	Provazniková	University of Pardubice	Czech Republic	
Gloria	Rodriguez-Pina	FUNDECYT	Spain	
Aidan	Roe	ITEM Associates	United Kingdom	
Manu	Setälä	TCH	Finland	
Kussai	Shahin	ASTER	Italy	
Ken	Stockil	Innovation Exchange	Ireland	
Patrick	Sullivan	CMI	Ireland	
Oumeira	Tegally	AEC	France	
Ester	Torres	eris@	Belgium	
Dagmar	Vránová	EPMA	Czech Republic	
Irina	Zálišová	EPMA	Czech Republic	



**Annex IV - Guidelines for discussion DAY 2**

**“DBE Regional deployment issues” - Group Work DAY 2**

*The aim of this session is to brainstorm, discuss and clarify:*

- A) the key steps/actions for DBE deployment at regional level,*
- B) the region-specific issues and how to handle them*
- C) what is still missing in the peardrop toolkit.*
- D) Which way forward for DBE – regional perspective?*

**Part A**

---

**What key steps/actions should be considered by a region when dealing with...**

**...the presentation of the DBE Concept in the region to gain political support**

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**...potential legal issues**

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**...potential technical issues**

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**....DBE financing**

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

Other issues not covered before:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**Part B**

---

**Which region specific issues emerge when planning the deployment of DBE?**

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**Part C**

---

**In light of what discussed until now, what is still missing in the peardrop Toolkit (DBE Planning guide + Tools)?**

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**Part D**

---

**If you were asked to suggest a “way forward/road map” for the support of DBE deployment, what would you recommend to the European Commission? (e.g. in terms of future FP7 calls, Structural Fund, European Research Area and European Policies)**

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

## **Annex V – Compiled results of the workshop evaluation**

### **SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

(20 questionnaires collected in total by eris@)

#### **Part A**

**Answers are shown in percentage**

	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	NA
Pre-event organization	75%	25%			
Assistance during the event	80%	20%			
Usefulness of Info Pack	45%	55%			
Technical facilities (screens, microphones, etc.)	50%	45%	5%		
Agenda of the event	45%	55%			

#### **Summary of comments:**

- Very good exercise and venue (nice change from usual hotel venues), excellent overall
- It should be considered more “free time”, day 1 was too long. More “free time” would allow unofficial networking.

#### **Part B**

**Answers are shown in percentage:**

	Very Interesting	Interesting	Adequate	Poor	NA
Introduction of the workshop	30%	60%		5%	5%
Work in groups DAY 1	65%	25%			10%
Work in groups DAY 2	65%	25%	5%		5%
Reporting back (DAY 2)	60%	25%			10%
Participants Comments & Suggestions (DAY 2)	35%	45%	5%		15%

#### **Comments:**

- The workshop should not over-structure the reporting back as this can lose the essence of the content (e.g. by disaggregating feedback from regions and losing the bigger picture). It would have been clearer on the first day if each region was presented one by one in the feedback.
- Nice content with good evolution and practical orientation.
- Appreciation of regional presentations, although it should have been more DBE related content.
- The open discussion of Day 1 was not too effective because of the large group.

#### **Part C**

**Additional remarks regarding this event (e.g. content, structure) please add below:**

- Very interesting event, really interesting to hear the different regional experiences and to identify synergies.
- Well organised and rich in information: the key items were highlighted.

- Positive the operational role of each participant, especially useful the sessions in small groups – which encouraged the communication among regions.
- Organisers should have collected and distributed in advance the text of all PPTs.
- Too much time given to the wrap-up sessions in both days.
- Engagement in the discussions of SMEs and of potential future entrepreneurs should be considered.
- An event that presents a simulation of DBE could be very useful.

**Any specific messages you would like to address to (Organising body, EC Officials, Speakers etc...):**

- The European Commission should show more commitment in financing DBE pilots.
- A DBE technological platform is urgently needed.
- Thank you for organising such event.
- The **peardrop** project has provided a valuable user perspective to the DBE project. Additional future user-lead activities are essential, in parallel with the technological platform development.
- The European Commission approached the topic in a too political way.

**Your comments on the value-added aspects/benefits of the event to (the aims of the event itself, your daily work, knowledge of the field, etc. ...):**

- The even has given the opportunity to clarify some of the “dark” issues of DBE, related to topics like: legal framework, technological infrastructure, business cases.
- Good to understand the potential synergies and opportunities to work further together in the future.
- A lot of issues that are outside the scope of peardrop were not raised. It would be useful to communicate the wider European Commission plans for DBE deployment and to see where user activities like **peardrop** ones, can fit in.
- The event was the occasion for participants to improve their knowledge of the DBE concept and to meet and discuss with other regional representatives.
- The workshop was extremely beneficial for learning more about the issues that other regions are facing and for networking.
- The event as a good occasion to stimulate individuals thinking, while learning.

**Do you have any comments/suggestions for peardrop future dissemination activities aiming at engaging more regions in the field of DBE (invitation mailing lists, website, target audience, newsletter, etc...):**

- other meetings and actions should be organised for policy-makers.
- DBE and **peardrop** should have a dedicated session on EU-wide events like IST conference of eChallenges.
- It would be good to build up existing case studies with the 13 regions so to engage other regions for the future. Do not lose the momentum.
- Leverage on Open Source developer groups and on online discussion forums that target such people – and not only those that have already engaged in the DBE concept.
- Including the topic of ICT interoperability could give additional depth to the discussion.
- Use mass media communication at local level.
- It is important that regions continue to share experiences and knowledge, even after **peardrop**.